THE TRIPLE CORD OR A TREATISE

PROVING THE

Truth of the Roman Religion,

By Sacred Scriptures { Taken in the Literall Sense:
Expounded by Ancient Fathers:
Interpreted by Proteſtant Writers.

WITH

A Diſcouery of ſundry ſubtile Slights vſed by Proteſtants, for euading the force of ſtrongeſt Arguments, taken from cleereſt Texts of the foreſaid Scriptures.

Si quiſpiam preualuerit contra vnum, duo reſiſtunt ei: Funiculus triplex difficilè rumpitur. Eccleſ. 4. 12.

If a man preuayle agaynſt one, two reſiſt him: A triple Cord is hardly broken.

Permiſſu Superiorum, M. D C. XXXIIII.

THE EPISTLE DEDICATORY, TO THE PROTESTANT NOBILITY OF GREAT BRITAINE.

RIGHT HONOVRABLE LORDS,

The Conceites of Men are ſo various, & the Guifts of Nature ſo vnlike, vvith the qualities of Climats ſo different, as that vve may by our Vnderſtandings obſerue, as great

Variety in Wits and Manners, as vvith our Eies vve ſee in Faces, and Fauours. For ſome, as I may ſay, are ſo vnfortunatly borne, as hauing no reguard to true Honour and Nobility, vvhich is euer founded vpon true Vertue; they vvholly dedicate themſelues and their daily endeauours, to the only gayning and enioying of ſuch pleaſures & profits, as may beſt pleaſe the Corporall Senſes, or othervviſe comply vvith the aduantage of Temporall Fortunes: nothing fearing any blemishes of Honour, vvhileſt they may obtayne the foreſayd Ends.

Yet others riſing vnder a more proſperous planet, are ſo greatly taken vvith the deſire and loue of true Honour and Renovvne, as that for the gayning or increaſe therof, all corporall Contents and temporall Cõmodities vvith greateſt ſcorne they trample & contemne; and their deareſt Lyues they ioyfully

expoſe

expoſe to greateſt hazards.

It is true Honour, and celebrity of Name vvhich theſe men ſeeke to purchaſe; Honour by Wiſdome, Learning Fortitude, Magnanimity, Magnificence, and other ſuch like Heroicall Vertues, vvhich as ſo many Potent Princes, create men truly noble. Theſe are They, that gaue ſplendour to your right Honourable Progenitours, from vvhome by direct lyne you dravv your Nobility: and theſe are they vvho giue to your Selues a plentifull increaſe of all Honour, through your ovvne moſt vvorthy, and memorable deſerts.

It vvere true Ruſticity to ſay, that Children are not honorable in the Honour of their Parents. Do not the (1) Euangeliſts deſcribe at large the Genealogy of Chriſt our Lord and his B. Virgin-Mother, as alſo of S. *Iohn Baptiſt*, thereby to proue that theſe greateſt Herões, vvere truly noble in their Progenitors?

(1) *Mat.3.1. Luc.3.23. Luc.1.5.*

nitors? Doth not from the ſame roote *S. Hierome* deriue the prayſes of noble *Paula*, affirming that *she vvas noble in byrth*, as being *the iſſue of the Gracchi, the offspring of Scipions, & the heire of Paul*? Doth not *S. Gregory* (3) *Nazianzen* for ſplendour of their Stemmes, highly extoll *S. Cyprian* and *S. Baſil*, though otherwiſe moſt renowned for their learning and ſanctity? Yea thoſe (4) famous Heathen Nobles *P. Scipio* & *Q. Fabius*, vvhē they heard, or read the glorious geſts of their Anceſtours, or beheld their Statues, they vvere greatly inflamed vvith the loue of their Vertues.

(3) *Orat. de S. Cypr. & orat. de S. Baſil.*

(4) *Salluſt.*

Iulius Ceſar, but looking vpon the Image of *Alexander* the *Great*, vvas thereby excited to the vndertaking and performance of things truly great. And *Alexander* himſelfe, remembring the Triumphes of his Father, they ſerued to him as the sharpeſt ſpurrs to pricke him forvvard to the gayning an Immortali-

ty

ty of his owne Name? Wherefore my Honourable Lords, make right account that saying of *Plato* to be most true, and truly Yours, *The vertues of Fathers are the Treasures of Children*, in which you may truly glory, and desire to imitate.

Yet must I humby make bould, to intimate this further vnto your Honours, that whē your Fathers worthes are increased and enriched with your owne Merits, then your Nobility is more complet, & more truly free from all maleuolous Exceptions. *The* (5) *Iewes gloryed that their Father was Abraham, but Christ bad them if they be the Children of Abraham, to do the workes of Abraham.* Yea they rayſed their Pedigree ſo high, as that they a- nouched they had, but *one* (6) *Father God himſelfe; But Ieſus therefore ſayd to them, If God were your Father, verily you would love me, for from God I pro-*

(5) Jo. 8. 39.

(6) Io. 8. 42.

ceeded

ceeded and came. So that to make your Nobility, Firme and Immortall, you muſt adioyne your ovvne vertues: for no more can it ſubſiſt vvithout Theſe, then Man vvithout Reaſon.

What did it auayle profane and ſenſuall *Eſau*, that his Father vvas holy *Iſaac*? or rebellious *Abſalom*, that he vvas Sonne to the moſt valourous King *Dauid*? Or foolish *Roboam*, that he had vvyſeſt *Salomon* for his Father? nothing did this profit, but to augment their shamefull Infamy in this vvorld, and their Eternall miſery and punishment in the next, by ſo fouly degenerating from ſo Noble Progenitours.

But ſo povverfull is Vertue, for the Creation of Nobility, as that many borne in a groſſe ayre, of obſcure parentage, through the Glory of their merits and vvorthieſt Actes haue shined to the vvhole vvorld, as ſo many ſtarres, leauing Honour to their Poſterity, vvhich

their

their Fathers vvanted. Tinne is extracted from Siluer, yet is not Siluer; and Gold proceedeth from the baſe matter of Earth, and yet is not Earth, but precious Gold. It is much better, of an ignoble Race, through vertuous Actions to become Noble, then of a Noble Stocke, by baſe vices, to become contemptible.

Thare, *Abrahams* Father vvas an Idolater, and yet the Sonne for his admirable vvorth had the Honour to be ſtyled, (7) *The Father of the Faithfull, and him, in vvhoſe Seed, all Nations ſhould be bleſſed*, the *Meſsias* of the vvorld being to riſe from thence. (8) *Moyſes* & (9) *Dauid*, vvere by condition Shepheards, but through their noble Actes became renovvned Princes. Profane Hiſtories are plentifull in theſe Examples, but I haſten to that vvhich giueth life and luſtre, yea the laſt perfection to all Nobility.

(7) Rom. 4. 11.
(8) Ex. 3. 1.
(9) 1. Reg. 9. pſal. 77. 71.

This is Chriſtian Nobility (vvorthy Peeres) vvhich vvill make you to be men truly borne of God, to haue him for your Nobleſt Father; and through the Influences of his Grace, to imitate, & in ſome, though imperfect, ſort, to expreſſe in your Selues, his Purity, Sanctity, Innocency, Wiſdome, Iuſtice, Mercy, & the like; by theſe no leſſe repreſenting his Diuine Image, then Sonnes do the faces and conditions of their carnal Parents. Theſe are thoſe true Nobles, vvhich the Princely Eagle S. Iohn (10) deſcribeth to be borne of God; not of Bloud. Theſe are they vvhome the Sacred (11) Scriptures do honour, vvith thoſe glorious titles of being *the Sonnes of God, the friends of God, Heyres of God, and Coheires of Chriſt, partakers of his diuine Nature, Kings, Gods.*

(10) Ioh. 1. 13

(11) Ia. 2. 12. Rom. 8. 14. 17. 2. Pet. 1. 4. 1. Pet. 2. 9. Ie. 10. 34

Novv to be linked vvith this kinred, and ſo to be exalted to the higheſt Nobility, our heauenly Father requireth in his

his Children that by ſacred vertues they ſeeke to glorify, and magnify his holy Name, for ſo himſelfe promiſed, vvhen he ſaid, (12) *Whoſoeuer ſhall glorify me, I vvill glorify him: and they that contemne me, ſhallbe ignoble.* The Vertues vvherby God is chiefly glorifyed, and vvhereby Men vpon Earth do deriue their Nobility from the King of heauen, are according to the beloued Apoſtle, diuine *Faith*: for (13) *Whoſoeuer believeth that Ieſus is Chriſt, is borne of God.* And, *All that is borne of God, ouercommeth the vvorld, and this is the victory vvhich ouercommeth the vvorld, our Faith.*

(12) 1. Reg. 2. 30.

(13) 1. Iohn 5. 1. 4.

But beſids *Faith*, is likevviſe required *Charity*, for (14) *Euery one that loueth is borne of God.* As alſo *Iuſtice*, for (15) *Euery one vvhich doth Iuſtice is borne of him.* And laſtly, filiall *Obedience*, and conformity to the vvill of our heauenly father, vvhoſe eldeſt Sonne aſſureth

(14) 1. Iohn 4. 7.

(15) 1. Iohn 2. 29.

vs all, that, (16) *vvhoſoeuer ſhall do the vvill of my Father that is in heauen, he is my Brother, Siſter, and Mother.* O admirable Honour! O incredible povver of vertue! Hovv many good Mothers, Brothers, and Siſters, vvould haue thought themſelues moſt highly honoured, if they might haue beene linked vvith Chriſt in theſe degrees of carnall propinquity. And yet, as *S. Chriſoſtome* truly teacheth, (17) *They are neerer of kin to God, vvho do his vvill, then thoſe vvho are ioyned vvith greateſt allyance of Bloud.*

(16) Mat. 12 50.

(17) Hom. 45. in Mat.

So that for a man to contract affinity vvith God, and thereby to be made of the Bloud Royall, and to attayne to the higheſt degree of Nobility, he muſt of neceſſity haue his Soule adorned vvith thoſe heauenly Graces of Faith, Charity, Iuſtice, Obedience, and the like. His Coũtry muſt be the ſupernall Hieruſalem; his higheſt Honour the

preſeruation of Gods Image, and conformity to his Patterne, vvhich by Reaſon, and Vertue are onely cauſed, and vvhereof at Gods Tribunall he muſt giue account. If he ſhall vitiouſly defyle that ſacred Image of greateſt Nobility, cut by the hād of God himſelfe, and thereby introduce another forme, to vvit, of the Serpent; then, muſt he ranke himſelfe to his euerlaſting dishonour, amongſt the ſpurious & ignoble.

Chriſtian Nobility doth not accept Perſons, and Conditions of men, but looketh into their Minds: From the manners she iudgeth a man to be ſeruile or noble. The only freedome vvith God, is not to ſerue Sinne: & the greateſt Nobility vvith him, is to be eminent in vertues. Who amongſt men in the ſight of God vvas more noble then *Peter*, a poore Fisherman? And vvho amongſt vvomen more illuſtious then bleſſed Mary the vvyfe of a Carpenter?

And yet to that Fisherman the keys of the kingdome of heauen vvere giuen: and to that poore vvife it vvas granted to be the Mother of him, vvho gaue the keyes. Wherefore Chriſtian vertues are they that muſt rayſe a man to the height of Honour.

Nowv, if he that is borne of a Regall Stocke, may iuſtly glory in Princely Nobility; much more he vvho truly deriueth himſelfe from the King of Kings and Creatour of all things. With this dignity all the Iuſt vpon Earth are honoured, being borne of God by a nevv Natiuity; and the Saintes in heauen do therby raigne, as puiſſant Princes in Eternall glory.

It is not vnvvorthy your remembrance, Noble Lords, that (18) *Mount Sion* hauing tvvo topps or Heads, vpon one vvas built a *Temple* for the Seruice of God, and vpon the other a *Pallace* for the ſeruice of the King: thereby to

(18) *Hier. in Quæſt. Hebraic. in Gen. ad Cap. 22. & in ep. 27. ad Euſtoch. Genebrard. in Pſal. 68.*

shevv

shevv, that these tvvo Honours must euer cohabitate, and not be separated, ech one giuing a peculiar Grace, and Splendour to the other.

The Romans also, as *S.* (19) *Augustine* recordeth, erected tvvo Temples neere adioyning togeather; the one they dedicated to *Honour*, the other to *Vertue*: therby signifying that in vvhat place there is splendour of Honour, in the same must be the exercise of Vertue. Wherfore vvhosoeuer desireth to shine vvith Christian Nobility, and to deriue his Pedigree from the King of Heauen & Earth, a Father Almighty, he must ground his Honour vpon diuine fayth, and rayse it to the Height, by the exercise of Charity, and true Religion.

(19) *De ciu. Dei l. 5. c. 12.*

But vvhen I mention Religion, it putteth me in mynd, that this King your Father espoused himselfe to (20) *a glorious Queene*, one so beautifull, that she had *neither spot, or vvrincle, or any such thing,*

(20) *Ephes. 5. 27.*

thing, but vvas Holy, and Vnſpotted:
(21) Eph. 5. 25. and this vvas his Beloued (21) *Church,* vvhome he affected ſo dearely, *that he*
(22) Act. 20. 28. *deliuered himſelfe for it, &* (22) *purchaſed it vvith his ovvne Bloud.* This then being the Spouſe of God, the Children of God, muſt needs be the Children of the Church, and she their Holy, and Vnſpotted Mother. A truth ſo certaine, that the glorious Martyr and Bishop S.
(23) De Eccl. vnitate c. 5. Auguſt. tom. de Symb. l. 4. cap. 10. Cyprian, doubted not to auouch, that (23) *He cannot haue God for his Father, that hath not the Church for his Mother.*

Novv, that this Mother-Church, is only the Catholike Roman Church, I shall proue at large in this ſubſequent Treatiſe: only be pleaſed in the meane to remember, vvhat a good old Bishop
(24) Lucius Ep. 1. ad Epiſc. Hiſp. & Gal. and Martyr ſaid of this point: (24) *The Roman Church is Apoſtolicall, and the Mother of all Churches, vvhich is neuer proued to haue Erred from the path of Apoſtolicall Tradition, nor depraued vvith Here-*

Hereticall Nouelties to haue fayled, according to the promiſe of our Lord himſelfe ſaying: I haue prayed for thee, that thy faith fayle not.

This Mother-Church it vvas, and only this, that had all your Forfathers for her louing and dutifull Children. It vvas She, that brought them forth Chriſtians by the Lauer of Baptiſme, & afterwards gaue them grouth, ſtrength and increaſe by her other Sacramentes. In her boſome they ſucked Sanctity during this life, and by her they vvere aduanced to the Court of Heauen, raygning there, truly Noble in immortall Glory.

Peruſe your Genealogies, looke into the Cheſtes of your Euidences, vievv the Records of all Courts, behould the ancient Monuments in your Churches, read all Chronicles and Hiſtories, they vvill all depoſe vnto You, that your Noble Anceſtours, all of them before

King Henry the eight his Raigne, and infamous Relapſe, vvere all of them Catholikes truly Romane: The Sect of Proteſtancy, or the very Name thereof as then not being in *Rerum Natura*, & ſo neuer heard, or dreamed of by any of your Ancient Bloud.

And not only this, but many moſt noble Lords and Ladies, your glorious Predeceſſours, duely conſidering the vanity of things tranſitory, the vncertainty of this preſent Lyfe, the innumerable dangers that therein occurre, the dreadfull Iudgment they vvere to vndergoe, and the finall Sentence of Ioy, or Miſery Eternall, vvhich they vvere to receiue: theſe importāt points, I ſay, they ſeriouſly and prudently pondering, vvith braueſt Reſolutions abandoned the preſent pleaſures, profits, or Honours this vvorld could affoard them, and betooke themſelues to the ſafeſt Port of Monaſticall, and Religious

ligious lyfe, therein to giue themſelues to the Exerciſe of Pennance for expiation of ſinnes, to the Contemplation of their Heauenly Fathers infinite and vnſpeakeable Perfections, for their imitation of his vertues, & to the needfull Preparation, and due Diſpoſition for the gayning, and enioying Nobility and Honour, euer permanent & immortall.

But if it vvere not to abuſe your *Honours* greateſt Patience vvith longer Diſcourſe, in a matter ſo euident, I ſhould eaſily preſent vnto your vvorthy vievves, many Kings and Queenes of our ovvne Country, for their ſingular vertues admired and honoured by all poſterity, vpon the former Conſiderations, to haue caſt by their Crovvnes, to haue dethroned themſelues of all ciuill Gouernement and Command, to haue reſigned their Scepters into the hands of others, and to haue giuen the

farevvell to all Earthly contents, and all this to retire themſelues the better in Religious lyfe for the exerciſe of Vertue and the gayning of the Kingdome of Heauen.

Theſe, Noble Lords, are the bright Starres you muſt delight to behould; theſe are the choyce patterns you muſt endeauour to imitate: Your vvorthy Spirits may, vvith much honour, emulate, their rareſt Vertues, and thereby propagate to your ovvne Poſterity the name and Honour, vvhich Kings and Kinred haue bequeathed vnto you. In theſe glory as your moſt Noble Progenitors; in your Selues reioyce, vvhen as liuely Images, you repreſent their Goodnes.

To degenerate from theſe vvould be greateſt diſhonour. His fall is fouler vvho hath happily ſtood, and the ſame more dãgerous from the greater height it happeneth. What doth it auayle a covvard-

covvardly Sonne, that his Father vvas valiant? Or a vicious Child that his Parents vvere vertuous? Certainly no other, but more cleerely, to blaze his greater shame, and moſt hatefull Ignominy. Your Noble Harts vvould not brooke the leaſt aſperſion to be layd vpō the Honour of your moſt renovvned Predeceſſours, by any man vvhatſoeuer, but vvith your vviſedoms you vvould cleere, and vvith Valour you vvould punish all offendours in that kind, as iuſtely thinking the Diſhonour vvould rebound vpon your ovvn perſons, if you should ſuffer ſuch Indignity to paſſe vvithout Controvvle. Much more vvill your Lordships be truly carefull and preciſe, that the leaſt ſtayne, or blemish do not fall from your Selues, vvhereby your Ancients ſplendour should by any vvaies, be obſcured.

O vvhat vnſufferable diſgrace is it,

for men ignoble and illiterate, not only to appeach your Noble Progenitors of ignorance, blindnes, and ſtupidity; but further to brand them vvith thoſe blacke markes of being men Superſtitious, Idolatrous, Antichriſtian; and ſo vndoutedly for euer damned. And yet theſe are the ordinary detractiõs vvhich come from the fovvle mouthes, and pennes of ignorant, and impudent Miniſters.

But vvho, not a vvretched Atheiſt, can poſſibly endure to haue his Heauenly Father moſt blaſphemouſly cenſured, as a cruell Tyrant, impoſing Lavves vpon his Children, and Subiects, vvhich are impoſsible to be obſerued, and yet the keeping of them to be neceſſary to their Saluation? To deſtiny and reprobate men from all Eternity, before their Creation, vvithout all reſpect of their free vvorkes, to certaine Damnation? To make the fountaine

taine of all Goodnes (all eares do abhorre to heare it) the Authour, Cauſe, Counſailour, Commaunder, & Compeller to all Sinne. To make the Sonne of God, Chriſt our Sauiour, to haue bene borne vvith ignorance, to haue dyed vvith deſpayre, & to haue ſuffered the very paines of the damned. And yet theſe are Tenets, holden for good by your learnedſt Proteſtant Doctours.

And vvhat Child legitimate can vvith Patience brooke, that his Mother moſt Honourable, Chaſt, & Faythfull to her Spouſe, should be accuſed and iudged for an Infamous Adultreſſe? No very Miniſter ſo ignorant, but vvill acknovvledge, that the Romane Church vvas the moſt chaſt & faythfull Spouſe of Chriſt, vvhen S. Paul proclaymed that (25) *her Fayth vvas renovvned in the vvhole vvorld*: And (26) *her obedience published into euery place:* and the *Romanes* highly commended, for that they

(25) Rom. 1. 8.

(26) Rom. 16. 19.

they had (27) *obeyed from the hart, vnto*
(27) Rom. 6. 17. *that forme of doctrine vvhich had beene deliuered vnto them.* And yet novv our viperous brood of Miniſters, vvil needs haue her to be the very *vvhore of Baby-*
(28) Apoc. 17 *lon;* (28) *a harlot &c. vvith vvhome the Kings of the Earth haue fornicated*: An Apoſtata from Chriſt her Spouſe; a profaner of Gods vvord and Sacraments; and in briefe, vvholy Antichriſtian.

And I muſt not forbeare to put your Honours in mind, of the diſhonourable diſgraces that theſe nevv-borne Sectaries, vvould put vpon your Selues, not onely as you are Nobles, but as you are Men, endovved vvith reaſonable Soules, vvhoſe principall Povvers are Vnderſtanding, and Freevvill, the moſt Eſſentiall differences betvveene men and Beaſts. Do not your Nevv-Maiſters generally teach, that God hath giuen to man only freevvill to ſinne, but not to do good? When they do

good

good, they are neceſſitated therunto, for as vvithout Gods grace they cannot do it, ſo the ſame being offered, they cannot reſiſt.

O hovv dangerouſly doth this Eclypſe the shyning ſplendour of your ovvne, and your Anceſtours moſt commendable Acts! vvhat can be praiſvvorthy, that includeth neceſſity? Or on the contrary blamable, that cannot be auoyded? If it vvas not in the povver and vvill of your Selues, and your Forefathers to do, or not to do thoſe Heroicall Deeds, but vvhat you did, you vvere neceſſitated to do through the enforcing hand and Ordination of God; vvhat cauſe or colour can be imagined for the rayſing of your Selues, vvithout all deſert, to ſuch higheſt Honours, and to grace euen your Succeſſours vvith ſuch titles of Dignity?

Be pleaſed to heare vvhat *Malleus Hæreticorum*, the learneſt *S. Auſtine*

thinketh of this barbarish Paradoxe: (29) *Neyther heer* (saith he, speaking of Free-vvill) *am I to search obscure bookes, from vvhence to learne, that no man deserueth Dispraise, or Punishment, vvho either vvilleth that vvhich Iustice doth not prohibite, or doth not that vvhich he cannot do. Do not the Shepheards sing these things in the Mountaynes, the Poets vpon the Stages, the vnlearned at their meetings, the learned in their Studies, Maisters in the Schooles, Bishops in Churches, and Mankind all ouer the vvorld?* So that *Shepheards, Poets, Rusticks &c.* do exhibite that Honour vnto you, vvhereof your ovvne Chaplaynes vvould vvillingly depriue you.

(29) L. de duabus Animabus c. 11.

Neyther is *Enuy* thus satisfyed, but vvith greateſt malignity purſueth euen your moſt laudable vertues, affirming that your beſt Deeds done for the Honour of God, his Church, your Country, or your Selues, are of all them, in them-

themſelues, & in the ſight of God, Sinnes abhominable, mortall or deadly, vvhich depriue a man of Gods grace, & thereby of all Spirituall lyfe, vvhich degrade him of that chiefeſt Nobility to be the adopted Sonne of God, & heyre of Eternall Kingdome, & finally make him the very ſlaue of the Diuell, and a moſt vvretched Caytiffe, condemned to eternall Miſery.

To vvhat end ſhould you expoſe your deareſt liues in the ſeruice of your King and Country to imminent dangers? To vvhat end ſhould you make your daily prayers, and vſe other Exerciſes of Deuotion, to the Honour of your ſupreme King, and your ovvne Soules good? Or giue your Charitable Almes to the Reliefe of the needy, if theſe deeds, payers, and Almes be all of them ſtayned vvith Sinne, offenſiue to the Maieſty of God, and exceeding preiudiciall, being all of them ſinneſull

to your ovvne Soules? And yet theſe, and ſundry other ſuch naſty principles, the pretended reformed Proteſtancy doth proiect vnto you.

Avvake then, Noble Lords, and let your eies of Truth ſend forth their cleereſt Raies, vvherby to diſpell thoſe darkeſt Clouds of Errour, vvhich ſo dangerouſly obſcure the brightnes of your Names & Nobilities. If theſe vnfortunate tymes do threaten, or obiect any danger of looſing ſome temporall Honour, your Lo^ps^ may reſt aſſured, that as the looſing of your liues for Loialty and Fidelity to your King and Country, doth nothing diminish, but greatly augment your former Renovvnes: So the loſſe of all trãſitory Glory for your Loyalty to God, for Obedience to his Church, for profeſſion of the Catholike Fayth, for the gayning of a Heauen, is not to looſe the leaſt title of Honour, but vvith plentifull increaſe to enrich

the ſame. To looſe lands or goods in the ſame honourable quarrel, is a pious Vſury, only lending them for a tyme vpon ſecureſt Bands, of not receiuing ten for the hundred, but a hundred for ten. And I cannot thinke ſo vnvvorthily of ſo vvorthy Spirits, that voluptuouſnes, and freedome in ſenſuall delights, vvhich your nevv Diuines do ſo loudly teach, & liberally allovv, that theſe, I ſay, can any thing deterre you from the chaſt Embracements of pure Vertue, and Religion, theſe being the baſe baites, vvhervvith the vulgar and ignoble are only taken.

Wherfore to conclude this my humble Suite vnto your Lo^ps. be pleaſed ſomtimes to reflect, that as you are truly carefull, and therein moſt commendable, to continue in your ſelues, & to propagate in your Children, the Anciēt Nobility vvhich your fathers haue left you, liuely repreſenting their vviſ-

dome, Fortitude, Magnanimity, and other such most bright beames of true Nobility: so no lesse carefull that you be, in expressing their Noble Christianity, which they, before many hundreds of yeares past, worthily purchased by profession of Catholicke fayth, by obedience to Christes Church, by Communion with Gods Saints, by participation of holy Sacraments, and by their other exercises of Religion and Charity. Whereas this last Century hath giuen the first, and ancientest Bloud which Protestancy can challenge, or expect.

And seeing that wherein your chiefest cares must euer be incumbent, is the labouring the Eternall Weale of your owne Soules, which men deuoyd of diuine fayth, and floting out of the Arke of the Catholicke Church, amongst the vncertaine vwaues of Errour and Heresy, can neuer attaine; therefore it will most neerly concerne you

you diligently to learne, vvherin that diuine Faith consisteth, how it is to be gayned, vvhat profession thereof necessary, vvhich is that Church vvhich is the Arke of safety, the Spouse of Christ, the Mother of the Faithfull, the Pillar of Truth, and so infallible a Iudge of all Controuersies in Religion, as vvhosoeuer shall refuse to obey her Sentence, is to be reputed by all men as a Heathen, and Publicane.

This is the busines that importeth; the neglect vvherof is not losse of temporall liberty, and imprisonement for life, or of large Reuenves, and mines of Gold, or the fauour and grace of Princes, & esteeme in Court, or of Strength, Health, Beauty, and other such guiftes of Nature; but it is the losse Eternall of all Heauenly ioyes, and the Soule and Bodies burning in vnquenchable fyre for all Eternity.

O discusse vvith your Selues at leasure

ſure, that deep queſtion propoſed by a Prince, (30) *VVhat ſhall I do, that I may receiue life euerlaſting?* or in the vvords of another (31) *VVhat muſt I do, that I may be ſaued?* Seeke, Search, Study, Meditate, Conferre, Read, neuer reſt vntill you fynd a true Reſolution of this vveightieſt Queſtion.

(30) Luc. 18. 18. Mat. 10. 17.

(31) Act. 16. 31.

If you vvill take it from Chriſt our Sauiour, he giueth it in theſe plaine vvords (32) *If thou vvilt enter into lyfe, keep the Commandements*. If you vvill haue it from your ovvne Doctour, the Doctor of the Gentils *S. Paul*, his anſvvere is, (33) *Belieue in our Lord Ieſus, & thou ſhalt be ſaued*. If you vvill haue then the full Reſolution, giuen by thoſe tvvo greateſt Doctours, it is *Fayth, and Keeping of the Commandements*, that vvill ſaue you. Whereupon the third & moſt renovvned Doctour *S. Auſtine* giueth the vvhole deciſion in theſe vvordes, (34) *I ſee not vvhy Chriſt ſhould ſay, If thou*

(32) Mat. 19. 17.

(33) Act. 16. 31.

(34) De fide & operibus c. 15.

thou vvilt haue lyfe euerlaſting, keep the Commandements; if vvithout obſeruing of them, by only fayth, one might be ſaued. Ioyne then theſe tvvo for your obtayning of Eternall happines: and haue euer fresh in your memories that ſacred ſentence of the Sonne of God, (35) *VV hat ſhall it profit a man if he gayne the vvhole vvorld, and ſuffer domage of his Soule?* And vvith this, I humbly kiſſe all your Lo^ps. hands, and euer deſire to remayne, (35) *Mat. 8. 36.*

Your Honours faythfull, though vnworthy Seruant,

N. N.

THE
PREFACE
TO THE
Proteſtant Reader.

SEEING it was euer houlden as a thing moſt worthy of greateſt prayſe, for a man to excell in all, or any of the liberal Sciences, the knowledge therof being not only to himſelfe, but alſo to others moſt vſefull and commodious; much more then is he to be honoured, who ſhall wholly, or chiefly imploy his paines and ſtudies in the attaining of the Science of Sciences, ſacred Diuinity, true Wiſdome, whoſe Obiect is God, and whoſe ſupreme end is the Omnipotent glory, and mans Beatitude. This Science it is, for the teaching wherof the beſt Maiſter, Chriſt our Lord, came into this world, according to thoſe his bleſſed wordes, (1) *For this was I borne, and for this I came into the world, that I ſhould giue teſtimony to the truth:* Which truth he (2) *taught in the Synagogue, and the Temple:* And (3) *went about all the Cityes and Townes teaching in their Synagogues, and preaching the Ghoſpell of the kingdome &c.* And not content that this preaching

(1) Io. 18. 37.
(2) Io. 18. 20.
(3) Mat. 9. 35.

ching of the Ghoſpell ſhould only be vſed by his owne perſon, and for his owne time, he gaue alſo in chiefeſt charge to his Apoſtles, and their Succeſſors, that they ſhould (4) *Teach all Nations &c. Teaching them to obſerue all thinges, whatſoeuer he had commanded them.* Now, for their encouragement, the better to performe this Charge impoſed, he aſſureth them by his Apoſtle, that (5) *Thus doing, they ſhall ſaue both themſelues, and them that heare them.* By which laſt words it alſo appeareth, that the knowledge of this Truth, this Ghoſpell, this Diuinity is requiſite and neceſſary for mans Saluation.

(4) Mat. 28. 19. 20.

(5) 1. Tim. 4. 16.

This truth and Ghoſpell we only learne aright by the vertue of Faith, through which we firmly aſſent to all ſuch Doctrines as the prime Verity, God himſelfe, doth reueale, and his holy Church doth propoſe vnto vs. A bleſsing ſo great, as that without it, (6) *It is impoſsible to pleaſe God*, and attayne Saluation, in being *the foundation of all ſuch thinges, as are to be hoped, or expected.*

(6) Heb. 11. 6. 1.

This faith as it is only gained by the free Guift of God, ſo is it only loſte by Infidelity and Hereſy, theſe being the oppoſites which deſtroy faith, and with which poſſibly ſhe cannot ſubſiſt. And if it be moſt true that euery Hereſy is a certaine Infidelity, and a true denial of all faith; what ſhall we thinke of the Hereſy of this vnfortunate Age, by which the integrity of faith is not only violated in one or other Article, or thoſe of leſſe moment and neceſſity (which yet by no meanes were to be tolerated, but by all Chriſtian hartes to be deteſted and accurſed) but generally in all as it were by an vniuerſall deluge of Apoſtacy, euen in the pointes of greateſt waight con-

concerning God, Christ, the Church, her Sacrifice and Sacramentes, Mans Iustification, Grace, Free-will, the Commandements, & many other such lyke; All which with singular impiety are so depraued and impugned by the Sectaries of these dayes, as that their Endeauours may seeme to ayme, and to be wholly imployed, insteed of an Heresy, to introduce with greatest boldnes, Madnes, and Malice, a generall Apostacy or Atheisme from the faith of Christ.

The serious Consideration, and feeling Commiseration of this so great a mischiefe, I must confesse (worthy Reader) was the mayne Motiue for my vndertaking and compyling this Treatise following: for whilest I remembred, that without entyre diuine Faith, and true worship and Religion towards God, no Saluation was to be expected; and withall saw such innumerable Soules (so dearly bought by the precious Bloud and death of Christ our Lord, Soules also most deare to me in sundry other most iust respectes) so continually to perish through the Infection of Heresy; I could not forbeare, but after my humble Prayers, adde also my poore and vnworthy labours, which if through Gods blessing, they may proue so effectuall, as to reduce any seduced Soule to the state of Saluation, I shall thinke them all most happily vndertaken, and ioyfully sustayned, and my selfe plentifully rewarded at the holy Hand of God.

Now, that my writings might proue more pleasing, and powerfull with the Prot. Reader, whose Saluation I thirst. I haue purposely restrayned my selfe to that sole kind of Argument, which himselfe doth affect, and euer vrge, which is the sacred Scriptures, or Written Word of God, to which he pro-

ſeſſeth in all Diſputes to appeale, and in all Doctrines to ſubſcribe, eſteeming, and making it his ſole Rule, and Square, wherby to be directed in all points of faith and Religion neceſſary to Saluation. To this alſo for the preſent I likewiſe appeale, making this the ſubiect of my whole Diſcourſe nothing doubting, but to make it appeare, and that moſt cleerly, that the Written Word, is our Catholicke Word, ſpeaking and teaching our (7) Roman faith, ſo anciently renowmed in the whole world.

(7) *Rom.* 1. 8.

And that it may be rightly obſerued how different are the proceedings of Catholickes and Proteſtantes, in the religious and ſincere handling and vſing of this ſacred Word, I deſire briefly to giue a iuſt account, of the Method, and order which I haue preſcribed to my ſelfe, and is generally obſerued, throughout this whole Treatiſe.

Firſt then, ſeeing the true ſtating of the Matter in diſpute, doth of it ſelfe often diſcouer the weaknes and falſhood of a bad Cauſe, and therfore all Heretickes do fraudulently ſet downe the ſtate of the Queſtion, changing and peruerting the true meaning therof, therby the better to hyde their owne Errors, & to traduce their Aduerſaries; I haue therfore in preuention herof, in the firſt place euer ſtated the Controuerſy aright, ſhewing what the Catholicke Church doth teach and beleeue as matter of faith, and this from her ſacred Councels & approued Doctors: and what ſhe permitteth her Schoolemen to diſpute as pointes indifferent, not defyned by her Decrees: for with theſe I fynd our moderne Sectaries (8) greatly to delude their Vulgar Readers, vrging theſe Schoole differences, as though they

(8) D. Morton, White, Featley.

they were Differences in Articles, and Concluſions of faith, which to affirme, is a *Grand Impoſture*, much frequented by D. Morton, who for want of better matter, ſtoreth and ſtuffeth his writinges with toyes in this kind

But not content with this, it is ordinary with Proteſtantes in their Sermons and Writings, moſt fowly to bely our Catholicke Cauſe, aſcribing vnto vs infinite groſſe, and moſt abſurd opinions, which we vtterly deteſt and deryde: they intending by malicious vntruthes to diſgrace that, which with ſound Argumentes they are not able to confute. I giue plentifull Examples of this bad dealing throughout this whole Booke.

Hauing thus cleered our Catholicke Doctrine, I next ſet downe what Prot. teach concerning the point in Controuerſy. In which I fynd them often at deadly wars amongſt themſelues, and that not for Points diſputable and indifferent, but for the Chiefeſt Articles, and Concluſions of Faith, the true beliefe wherof is neceſſary to Saluation. In theſe their differences, I ordinarily ſet downe for Prot. Doctrine, that which is moſt commonly taught by the Engliſh Prot. Church, or by ſuch others, as are moſt renowned amongſt their Brethren, for their ſuppoſed Wiſdome, and Learning.

But in thus ſearching what their opinions are, I ſtill obſerue, and accordingly proue, that wherin they diſagree from the Catholicke faith, therin they do agree with ſome Ancient Hereticke, formerly confuted, and condemned by Councels and Fathers.

And not only this, but I fynd further, that they runne themſelues vpon fundry groſſe Errors, which were

were not euen dreamed on by any former Heretikes, and which once admitted, would ineuitably inferre a generall Apoſtacy from the Chriſtian faith. This is the Courſe which I generally vſe for the true expreſſion of the point in Controuerſy; which point thus cleered, I addreſſe my ſelfe in the nexte place to ſuch proofes for the Catholicke cauſe, as the ſacred Scriptures do plentifully affoard: from whence yet I only produce ſuch textes, as being taken in their natiue, ſimple, and literall ſignification, do ſpeake moſt plainly for the Catholicke Truth. But becauſe nothing can be ſpoken in termes ſo playne, but what the wit and malice of the Deuill and his Miniſters will in ſome ſorte depraue, inuenting for that end ſome Euaſion or other, therby to weaken the force of the wordes being taken in their proper ſignification; I do therfore alſo take notice of theſe poore ſhiftes, and do further ſhew, that they are mere fancyes, faigned and taught without all ground or colour of truth, wholly impertinent, often ridiculous, and euer ſuch, as with the like liberty, any Hereſy though neuer ſo forlorne may eaſily be defended, & any Article of our Chriſtian faith, though neuer ſo neceſſary, be dangerouſly impugned.

But neither is this detorting of the wordes of Scripture from their proper meaning, the greateſt iniury now adayes offered to the word of God: For Sectaries further proceed, when all other meanes faile them, moſt accurſedly to corrupt the ſacred wordes and ſentences of Gods diuine word, adding wordes of their owne ſtamping to the holy textes, omitting, or taking away ſome of the ſacred words themſelues, miſtranſlating wordes, making them to

ſpeake

ſpeake thinges moſt different, and repugnant from their owne proper ſignification. And if all this will not ſerue their turne, through the euidence & fulnes of Scripture condemning their Errors, then they betake themſelues to that laſt moſt deſperate & damnable Refuge, of that Atheiſticall denying, or making Apocryphall whole entyre Bookes of holy Writ: which impious freedome, if it might be admitted, would ſhortly diſcharge the whole Canon of Scripture from any Scripture at all.

But becauſe it is another vſuall ſhifte vſed by Proteſtantes, to fly from the wordes to the ſenſe, that neither they, nor we, as partiall Iudges, ſhould giue ſentence therof; I do therfore appeale for the fynding out of the true ſenſe of the Scriptures to the Interpretations, and Expoſitions made by the Ancient Fathers, who liuing in the pureſt tymes of the Church, neighbouring vpon the Apoſtles, flouriſhing in learning, ſhining in ſanctity, and ignorant of our preſent Contentions, may in all reaſon be thought, & accepted for Iudges moſt competent, vncorrupt, and impartiall. Neither do I produce theſe as barely affirming what themſelues thought or practiſed, or ſpake in heat of diſputation againſt their Aduerſaries, but what they dogmatically taught in their Commentaries, Expoſitions, and Interpretations of the ſacred Scriptures: or what is acknowledged, confeſſed, and diſliked in them by Prot. as making vnanſwerably for our Catholicke faith, and ſtrongly confuting, and condemning the Prot. Errours.

Neither do I wholly reſt in this manner of proofe, though ſuperabundant for my Cauſe: But

I likewiſe in greateſt ſurpluſſage adioyne herunto, the aboundant Interpretations of Scriptures made by Prot. writers, moſt agreable to the former made by Fathers, and wholly confirming our Catholicke faith, and therin impugning their other Brethren who oppoſe againſt it. Now, if the Textes of ſacred Scriptures, taken in their proper and literall ſenſe, and the anſwerable Expoſitions made by the holy Fathers, and ſundry of the learnedſt Prot. writers, do all of them conſpire in making that ſenſe of Scripture, which wholly agreeth with the doctrine and practiſe of the Catholicke Roman Church; I do not ſee what more can be required by any indifferent, & vnderſtanding man, for the making it to appeare cleere, as the ſunne at Noone day, that the Written Word of God is that which teacheth vs our Catholicke faith, and confuteth and condemneth ſuch Errours and hereſyes as aryſe againſt it.

Laſtly ſeeing, all this notwithſtanding, Prot. do not deſiſte to obiect ſome darker paſſages of Scripture againſt others moſt plaine, and for ſuch confeſſed by Fathers & Prot; I do therfore not forbeare to take notice of them, but withall do plainly ſhew, that the ſaid textes taken in their literall ſenſe, do nothing make againſt vs, and ſo moſt impertinently vrged; and being explayned by other plainer places, do ſtrongly make againſt themſelues who vrge them. And if not the wordes but the ſenſe, muſt be regarded, then I frequently alleadge both Fathers and Prot. ſo expounding the ſame, as that their Expoſitions are full anſwers to what is obiected by other Prot. So weakely, and not at all, is Hereſy truly grounded vpon the word of God.

This

This, Christian Reader, is the course obserued by me through this whole worke, which whether I be iudged duly to performe or no, I most willingly leaue to the dispassionate Censure of the Iudicious: who will easily herby perceiue, that Prot. pretending to fly to the Scriptures, as their only refuge, do therin make flight to their mortall Enemy, who cutteth their throates. That which for my poore paynes at the handes of the good Reader I shall only requeſt, is, that all former preiudicate opinion against Catholicke Religion set apart, and all base and vnworthy feare of temporall losses in Honours, Estates, or Liberties couragiously shaken off, that he firmly beleiue, and constantly professe that only Faith, and Religion which Gods diuine Word doth teach, the holy Fathers do confirme, and sundry of the learnedst Prot do acknowledge for true: which doing, he shall gayne that faith, without which, according to the Apostle, (9) *It is impossible to please God.* Which according to S. Ambrose, (10) *Is the firme foundation of all vertues.* According to S. Chrysostome, (11) *The origine of Iustice, the head of Sanctity, the beginning of Deuotion, the ground-worke of Religion.* And according to S. Austine, (12) *The beginning of mans saluation, without which no man can come to the fellowship of the Sonnes of God: because without it, neither in this world can any man obtayne the Grace of Iustification, nor in the world to come shall possesse lyfe Eternall.* A fearefull Sentence, & much to be pondered by Infidels, and Heretickes, who are certainly deuoyd of this diuine Faith.

(9) *Hebr.* 11. 6.

(10) *In Psal.* 40.

(11) *Ser. de fide, spe, & charit.*

(12) *Ser. de Temp.* 38.

A TABLE OF THE CONTENTS of the Chapters, and Sections contained in this Booke.

The Preparatiue to the Triple Cord.

Wherin is proued the dignity and infallibility of the written word of God, or ſacred Scriptures: as alſo the neceſſity of fynding out the true Senſe intended by the Holy Ghoſt: with certaine infallible Rules for the fynding out of the ſaid ſenſe.

Section 1.

The true ſtate of the Queſtion concerning the verity of the ſacred Scriptures. Whether the Scriptures cõtained in the Bible be the word of God himſelfe, truly diuine & infallible, in euery leaſt parcell, or Text therof? And therfore for ſuch are by all the faithfull to be receyued, beliued, and obeyed. pag. 1.

Section 2.

That the ſacred Scriptures are the true Word, diuine, and infallible, the Scriptures themſelues do teſtify. p. 3.

Section 3.

That the Ancient Fathers do teach and beliue the ſacred Scriptures to be the true word of God, of diuine and infallible authority. p. 5.

Section 4.

That ſundry Prot. do acknowledge the ſacred Scriptures to be the word of God, of diuine and infallible Authority. p. 6.

Section 5.

That it is impious to corrupt, or reiect any part of Canonicall Scripture. p. 7.

Section

THE TABLE

Section 6.

The neceſsity of fynding out the true ſenſe of the Scriptures. p. 9.

Section 7.

That the ſacred Scriptures do admit ſeuerall, true, and different Senſes but not contrary; aswell Literall as Myſticall: and of the force of ſuch Argumentes as are taken from any of the forſaid ſenſes. p. 12.

Section 8.

Certaine Rules preſcribed for the diſcerning of the ſimple literall ſenſe from the figuratiue: and for the fynding out of the true ſenſe intended by the Holy Ghoſt. p. 15.

Section 9.

An Examination of ſuch Rules as Proteſtantes ordinarily preſcribe and obſerue, for the fynding out the true ſenſe of the ſacred Scriptures. p. 19.

Section 10.

That the Certaine and Infallible Rule, for the fynding out of the true ſenſe of the Scriptures, is the Church of Chriſt. p. 21.

Section 11.

An Explanation of what we meane by the Church, when we ſay, that the true vnderſtanding of the Scriptures, and the finall Deciſion of all Controuerſies in Religion, is to be taken from the Church. p. 23.

CHAP. I.

Section 1.

THE true ſtate of the *Queſtion* in Controuerſy betwene Catholickes and Proteſtantes concerning the Iudge of Controuerſies in Matter of Religion conſiſteth in this:

Whether beſides the ſacred Scriptures, any other infallible Authority and Iudge is to be acknowledged, by which the diuine faith, and the true ſenſe of Scriptures may be propoſed to the faithful, as reuealed by God, and to be beliued:

And whether the ſaid Authority and power of Iudging, be to be aſcribed to the Church, to Generall Councels, and to the Fathers of the Primitiue Church? Or only to the ſacred Scriptures themſelues, or the Spirit of euery particular Man. p. 33.

THE TABLE

Section 2.

The ſacred Scriptures cleerly teach, that we are to repaire to the Church of Chriſt, for the fynall decyding of Controuerſies in Religion. p. 40.

Section 3.

That the Ancient Fathers expound the ſacred Scriptures agreably with Catholiks, in proofe of the Church being the Iudge of Controuerſies. p. 50.

Section 4.

That Prot. expound the ſacred Scriptures agreably with Catholickes in proofe of the Church being the Iudge of Controuerſies; And that ſundry Proteſtants do teach, & defend the ſame Doctrine. p. 53.

CHAP. II.

Section 1.

THe true State of the Queſtion concerning the Churches Infallibility, or not Erring.

Whether the vniuerſall Church of Chriſt can erre in defyning matters of Faith, and Manners: Or rather, that ſuch her Decrees are alwaies moſt true and infallible, and for ſuch are to be believed and obſerued by the faithfull. p. 62.

Section 2.

It is proued by Scriptures, that the vniuerſall Church of Chriſt, cannot erre in matters of Faith and Manners. p. 65.

Section 3.

That the Fathers do expound the Scriptures in proofe, that the Church of Chriſt cannot erre. p. 73.

Section 4.

Proteſtant Writers teach, that the Church of Chriſt cannot erre in matters of faith. p. 75.

Section 5.

Obiections from Scripture in proofe, that the Church may erre in matters of faith, anſwered. p. 77.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

Section 1.

THE true ſtate of the Queſtion concerning the difficulty in vnderſtanding the ſacred Scriptures.

Whether the ſacred Scriptures be ſo eaſy and plaine to be vnderſtood, as that without the Explication of the Church, they are ſufficient to decyde and end all Controuerſies of Faith: or rather in many places are very obſcure, and difficult, euen to the learned. p. 82.

Section 2.

That the Scriptures are obſcure, and hard to be vnderſtood, it is proued by the Scriptures themſelues. p. 83.

Section 3.

That the Ancient Fathers expound the ſacred Scriptures agreably with Catholickes, in proofe of the Scriptures obſcurity, and difficulty. p. 87.

Section 4.

That Proteſtantes expound the ſacred Scriptures agreably with Catholickes in proofe of the Scriptures obſcurity: And that ſundry Prot. do teach and defend the ſame Doctrine. p. 89.

Section 5.

That the Scriptures are obſcure, it is further proued by ſundry Reaſons. p. 92.

Section 6.

That the conference of one place of Scripture with another, doth neither make the Scriptures to be our Iudge of all Controuerſies, nor alwaies eaſy to be vnderſtood. p. 94.

Section 7.

An Examination of ſuch Obiections as are vſually vrged by Prot. againſt the Scriptures Obſcurity. p. 101.

CHAP. IV.

Section 1.

THE true ſtate of the Queſtion concerning the Interpretation of Scriptures, and deciding Controuerſie by the Priuate ſpirit of euery particular Man. p. 105.

Section

OF CHAPTERS.

Section 2.

It is proued by Scriptures, that the ſaid Scriptures are not made eaſy to be vnderſtood, or our Iudge of all Controuerſies, by the ſpirit reuealing to euery Priuate Man, the true ſenſe, and determination therof. p. 107.

Section 3.

It is proued by the Ancient Fathers that the Priuate ſpirit is not a Iudge ſufficient for the deciding of Controuerſies, and interpreting the Scriptures. p. 111.

Section 4.

It is proued by Prot. that the Priuate Spirit is not our Iudge of Controuerſies. p. 112.

Section 5.

It is proued by Reaſon, that the Priuat ſpirit is not our Iudge of Controuerſies. p. 113.

Section 6.

Obiections from Scripture for the Priuate ſpirit, anſwered. p. 115.

CHAP. V.

Section 1.

THe true ſtate of the Queſtion concerning the Bookes of Scripture Canonicall or Apocryphall.

Whether the Bookes of Toby, Iudith, Wiſdome, Eccleſiaſticus, and the firſt and ſecond of Machabees, be Scriptures truly Canonicall, or Apocryphall. p. 121.

Section 2.

It is proued by ſundry Reaſons and Authorities, that the forſaid Bookes are truly Canonicall. p. 126.

Section 3.

That the Primitiue Church of Chriſt, and the Councells therin celebrated, haue admitted, and approued for Canonicall, the forſaid Bookes of Eccleſiaſticus, Wiſdome, Toby, Iudith, Machabees &c. p. 131.

Section 4.

That Proteſtantes themſelues do defend the forſaid Bookes. p. 134.

Section

OF CHAPTERS.

Section 5.

Sundry Obiections produced againſt the forſaid Bookes, anſwered. p. 137.

CHAP. VI.

Section 1.

THe true ſtate of the Queſtion, concerning the Tranſlations of the Bible.

Whether the Tranſlation of the ſacred Scriptures, ordinarily called the Old Vulgar Latin Tranſlation, be to be vſed and preferred before all Tranſlations made by Proteſtantes. p. 141.

Section 2.

It is proued by ſundry Argumentes, that the Vulgar Latin Tranſlation of the Bible, is to be preferred before all Tranſlations made by Proteſtantes. p. 144.

Section 3.

Obiections againſt the Vulgar Tranſlation, anſwered. p. 150.

CHAP. VII.

Section 1.

THe true ſtate of the Queſtion, concerning Traditions.

Whether, beſides the ſacred Scriptures, or written word of God, there be not another word of God, not written, which is called Traditions: And whether their Authority be certaine and infallible, in deciding matters of Faith. p. 152.

Section 2.

It is proued by the ſacred Scriptures, that beſides themſelues, or the written word, there are certaine Traditions of the Church, or word of God, not written, which we are bound likewiſe to beleeue, and obſerue. p. 156.

Section 3.

That the Ancient Fathers do expound the ſacred Scriptures in proofe of vnwritten Traditions. p. 169.

Section 4.

That the learnedſt Proteſtantes are inforced to acknowledge and beliue our Catholicke Doctrine of Traditions. p.170.

Section 5.

Obiections againſt Traditions taken from Scriptures, anſwered. p.176.

CHAP. VIII.

Section 1.

THe true ſtate of the Queſtion, concerning S. Peters Primacy.

Whether Chriſt our Sauiour ordained S. Peter ſupreme Head or Paſtour, not only of the Apoſtles, but of the vniuerſall Church. p.181.

Section 2.

It is proued by Scriptures, that S. Peter was appointed by Chriſt the Supreme head, not only of the apoſtles, but of the vniuerſall Church. p.184.

Section 3.

That the Fathers expound the ſacred Scriptures agreably with Catholickes, in proofe of S. Peters Primacy. p.198.

Section 4.

That Prot. alſo do agree with Catholickes in the Doctrine of S. Peters Primacy. p.204.

Section 5.

Obiections from Scripture againſt S. Peters Primacy, anſwered. p.207

CHAP. IX.

Section 1.

THe true ſtate of the Queſtion, concerning the Biſhop of Rome his Primacy in matters Eccleſiaſticall.

Whether the Primacy giuen by Chriſt to S. Peter, was giuen alſo to his ſucceſſors: And whether the Biſhops of Rome be the ſaid ſucceſſors. p.210.

Section 2.

It is proued from Scriptures and Reaſon, that the Primacy giuen to S. Peter was giuen alſo to his Succeſſors: and that the Biſhops of Rome are the ſaid ſucceſſors. p.215.

Section

OF CHAPTERS.

Section 3.

That the Fathers expound the Scriptures in proofe of the Bishop of Rome his ſucceeding S. Peter in the Primacy of the whole Church. p. 218.

Section 4.

That ſundry of the learnedſt Prot. do acknowledge, and teach the Primacy of the Roman Bishop. p.220.

Section 5.

Obiections taken from Scripture againſt the Popes Primacy, anſwered. p.223.

CHAP. X.

Section 1.

THe true ſtate of the Queſtion, concerning Antichriſt.

Whether Antichriſt be yet come; and whether the Bishop of Rome, can be ſaid to be Antichriſt. p. 225.

Section 2.

It is proued by the Scriptures that Antichriſt is not yet come: and that the Bishop of Rome, cannot be ſaid to be Antichriſt. p.228.

Section 3.

That the Fathers expound the Scriptures agreably with Catholickes, in proofe that the Pope cannot be Antichriſt. p.236.

Section 4.

That Prot. agree with Catholickes in the Doctrine of the Pope not being Antichriſt. p.239.

Section 5.

Obiections from Scripture, that the Pope is Antichriſt, anſwered. p. 241.

CHAP. XI.

Section 1.

THe true ſtate of the Queſtion, concerning Euangelical Counſailes, and the ſtate of Perfection.

Whether there be Euangelicall Counſailes, or workes of ſupererogation,

gation, which if they be obſerued or done, they are good and commendable; if omitted, not ſinfull: or whether all thinges that are good be commanded by God, and the omiſsion of them be ſinfull. p. 244.

Section 2.

It is proued by Scriptures that there are Euangelicall Counſailes or workes of ſupererogation, which if they be obſerued or done, they are commendable and meritorious, if omitted, not ſinfull. p. 247.

Section 3.

That the Fathers do expound the ſacred Scriptures anſwerably with Catholickes in proofe of Euangelicall Counſailes, and workes of Supererogation, and Perfection. p. 253.

Section 4.

That Prot. do agree with Catholickes in the Doctrine of Euangelicall Counſailes, and workes of Supererogation. p. 257.

Section 5.

Obiections from Scripture, againſt Euangelicall Counſailes, are anſwered. p. 260.

CHAP. XII.

Section 1.

THe true ſtate of the Queſtion, concerning Vowes propoſed. Whether the Vowes of workes of Perfection, as Pouerty, Chaſtity, and Obedience, be lawfull, and commendable now in the law of Grace. p. 263.

Section 2.

It is proued from the Scriptures, that the forſaid vowes of Perfection are lawfull and commendable. p. 266.

Section 3.

That the Fathers do expound the forſaid Scriptures in proofe of the vowes of Pouerty, Chaſtity, and the like. p. 271.

Section 4.

That Prot. defend with Catholickes the vowes of Pouerty Chaſtity, and the like: And that they confirme the ſame from the ſacred Scriptures. p. 275.

Section 5.

Obiections from Scripture againſt the vowes of Pouerty, Chaſtity, and the like, anſwered. p. 277.

CHAP.

CHAP. XIII.

Section 1.

THe true ſtate of the Queſtion, concerning the Marriage of Prieſtes.

Whether the vow of Chaſtity be ſo annexed to holy Orders, that after Ordination, they who are Conſecrated, can neither marry, nor vſe their wyues formerly married. p. 286.

Section 2.

It is gathered from the Scriptures, that the vow of Chaſtity is rightly annexed to holy Orders. p. 289.

Section 3.

The Fathers do gather from the Scriptures, that the vow of Chaſtity is rightly annexed to holy Orders. p. 290.

Section 4.

That Prot. teach the vow of Chaſtity to be rightly annexed to holy Orders. p. 292.

Section 5.

Obiections from Scriptures againſt the vow of Chaſtity in Prieſts, anſwered. p. 295.

CHAP. XIV.

Section 1.

THe true ſtate of the Queſtion, concerning Chriſt his deſcending into Hell.

Whether Chriſt our Sauiour truly deſcended in Soule into Hell, and there redeemed thoſe who were in Abrahams boſome, or Limbus: *Or that by hell ſhould only be vnderſtood his Graue, or his ſuffering the paines of Hell.* p. 299.

Section 2.

It is proued by Scripture, that Chriſt our Sauiour truly deſcended in ſoule into hell: And there redeemed thoſe who were in Abrahams Boſome, or Limbus. p. 303.

THE TABLE

Section 3.

That the Ancient Fathers do agreably expound the Scriptures in proofe of Chriſtes deſcending into hell, and his deliuering of the Iuſt in Captiuity. p. 306.

Section 4.

That Prot. Writers do teach the deſcending of Chriſt into Hell, and the deliuery from thence of the Iuſt that were in Captiuity. p. 309.

Section 5.

Obiections from Scripture againſt Chriſtes deſcending into Hell, anſwered. p. 311.

CHAP. XV.

Section 1.

THE *true ſtate of the Queſtion, concerning* Purgatory, *and Prayer for the dead.*

Whether beſides heauen and hell, after this lyfe there be a place of Purgatory, wherin the ſoules of the faithfull are temporally punished for their ſinnes committed in their lyfe tyme: and whether they may be relieued by the Sacrifices, prayers, and almes of their liuing friends: Or otherwiſe that inſtantly after death, euery ſoule either immediatly aſcendeth into heauen, or deſcendeth into hell. p. 313.

Section 2.

It is proued by Scriptures, that after this lyfe there is a place of Purgatory: and that therin the ſoules of the faithfull may be relieued by the Sacrifices, Prayers, and other ſpirituall helpes of their liuing friendes. p. 317.

Section 3.

The ancient Fathers expound the forſaid Scriptures agreably with Catholickes, in proofe of Purgatory, and Prayer for the dead. p. 327.

Section 4.

Purgatory, and Prayer for the dead taught, and beleeued by Prot. themſelues. p. 331.

Section 5.

Obiections from Scripture, againſt Purgatory, and Prayer for the dead, anſwered. p. 333.

CHAP.

CHAP. XVI.

Section 1.

THE true ſtate of the Queſtion concerning the Interceſſion, and Innocation of Angels, and Saintes.

Whether the Angels and Saintes in Heauen, do pray for men vpon Earth, And whether we may lawfully pray to them as Interceſſors to God for vs: or whether the ſaid Angels, and Saintes do heare our Prayers or know thinges done vpon Earth, and their Interceſſion be not a derogation from Chriſtes Mediation. p. 338.

Section 2.

It is proued by Scriptures, that the Angels and Saintes in heauen, do know our Prayers vpon Earth, and that they pray for vs, and we may lawfully pray vnto them, as Interceſſors for vs. p. 343.

Section 3.

Scriptures expounded by moſt Ancient Fathers, in proofe of the Interceſſion of Angels and Saints, and that we may lawfully innocate them. p. 355.

Section 4.

That Prot. do agreably teach with Catholickes, that the Angells and Saints in heauen do heare our prayers, do pray for vs in particular: and that we may lawfully pray to them. p. 359.

Section 5.

Obiections from Scripture, againſt Innocation of Angels & Saints, anſwered. p. 364.

CHAP. XVII.

Section 1.

THE true ſtate of the Queſtion, concerning the vſe and reuerence to be exhibited to Images of Chriſt and his Saints.

Whether it be lawfull to make the Images of Chriſt and his Saints, to place them in Churches, and to exhibite any honour, or reuerence vnto them: or that all this is Superſtition and Idolatry, contrary to the Commandement of God. p. 372.

Section

THE TABLE

Section 2.

It is proued by Scriptures, that it is lawfull to make the Images of Christ and his Saintes, to place them in Churches, and to exhibite honour, or reuerence vnto them. p.375.

Section 3.

That the Ancient Fathers expound the Scriptures for the lawfull vse of Images, and Religious Reuerence done vnto them, agreably with Catholickes, p.387.

Section 4.

That Protestant writers do acknowledge and allow the vse of Images in Churches: and that due honour may be exhibited vnto them. p.390.

Section 5.

Obiections from Scripture vrged by Protestantes against the lawfull vse of Images, answered. p.393.

CHAP. XVIII.

Section 1.

THe true state of the Question, concerning the Sacramentes of the New law conferring grace.

Whether the Sacraments of the New law do truly conferre Grace to the worthy receiuer, as Gods Instrumentall Causes: or that they are only signes and remembrances of Grace receiued by faith. p.396.

Section 2.

It is proued by Scriptures, that the Sacramentes of the New law do truly conferre grace to the worthy receiuer. p.403.

Section 3.

Reasons in proofe that the Sacramentes do conferre Grace. p.405.

Section 4.

That the Ancient Fathers do expound the Scriptures agreably with Catholickes, in proofe of the Sacramentes conferring Grace. p.408.

Section 5.

That the learnedst Prot. do agreably with Catholickes teach, that the Sacramentes of the New Law do conferre Grace to the worthy receiuer. p.413.

Section

OF CHAPTERS.

Section 6.

Obiections from Scripture, in proofe that the Sacramentes do not conferre Grace, answered. p.416.

CHAP. XIX.

Section 1.

THe true ſtate of the Queſtion concerning the number of the Sacramentes.

Whether there be ſeauen Sacramentes Inſtituted by Chriſt our Sauiour: to wit, Baptiſme, Confirmation, Euchariſte, Pennance, Extreme Vnction, Order, and Matrimony: or only two, Baptiſme, and the Lordes Supper. p.418.

Section 2.

It is proued by Scriptures that there are ſeauen Sacramentes inſtituted by Chriſt our Sauiour. p.424.

Section 3.

That the Ancient Fathers agreably with Catholickes beleiued and taught that there were ſeauen Sacramentes of the New law. p.428.

Section 4.

Prot. Writers do teach, and confeſſe the number of ſeauen Sacramentes agreably with Catholickes. p.432.

Section 5.

Contayning certaine Reaſons, or congruences eſtablishing the number of ſeauen Sacramentes. p.435.

Section 6.

Contayning certaine Obiections had from Scriptures againſt the number of ſeauen Sacramentes, with Anſweres thereto. p.440.

CHAP. XX.

Section 1.

THe true ſtate of the Queſtion concerning the neceſſity of Baptiſme.

Whether the Sacrament of Baptiſme, or the deſire therof, be not abſolutely neceßary to Salvation, not only becauſe it is commanded by Chriſt, but becauſe it is a meanes neceßary therto: ſo that Children dying without Baptiſme, cannot be ſaued. p. 442.

Section 2.

It is proued by Scriptures, that Baptiſme is neceſſary to Salvation. p. 447.

Section 3.

That the Ancient Fathers do expound the ſacred Scriptures in prooſe of the neceſsity of Baptiſme. p. 452.

Section 4.

That Proteſtant Writers do teach and defend the Catholicke Doctrine of the Neceſsity of Baptiſme. p. 455.

Section 5.

Obiections from Scripture, againſt the neceſsity of Baptiſme, anſwered. p. 457.

CHAP. XXI.

Section 1.

THE true ſtate of the Queſtion, *concerning the B. Sacrament of Chriſtes Body and Blood.*

Whether in the moſt holy Sacrament of the Euchariſt, vnder the formes of Bread and wine, there be truly and really, and not only in ſigne, figure, or repreſentation, conteyned the very Body and Bloud of Chriſt our Sauiour, which was borne of the B. Virgin Mary, and afterwards crucified. p. 468.

Section 2.

Wherin is inquired what Prot. vnderſtand by receyuing ſpiritually, or by faith? p. 473.

Section 3.

The Reall Preſence of Chriſtes Body & Bloud in the Sacrament, is proued by teſtimonies of Scripture taken frō the Old Teſtament. p. 479

Section 4.

That the Scriptures of the New Teſtament conuince our forſaid Catholicke

tholicke Reall Preſence of Chriſtes Body, and Bloud in the Euchariſt. p. 482.

Section 5.

That the Ancient Fathers do expound the Scriptures in proofe of our Catholicke Doctrine of the Reall Preſence, and Tranſubſtantiation. p. 498.

Section 6.

That Prot. Writers do teach and believe from Scriptures, the reall Preſence of Chriſtes Body, and Bloud in the Euchariſt. p. 511.

Section 7.

Obiections taken from the Scriptures, in diſproofe of the reall Preſence, anſwered. p. 515.

Section 8.

Obiections againſt the poſsibility of the Reall Preſence, anſwered. p. 521.

Section 9.

Obiections againſt the reall Preſence of Chriſtes Body and Bloud in the Euchariſt, in regard of certaine pretended indignities therupon inſuing, anſwered. p. 532.

Section 10.

The forſaid truth of the reall Preſence of Chriſtes Body, and Bloud in the B. Sacrament, is further proued by cleere and confeſſed miracles, wrought by God in teſtimonie therof. p. 534.

CHAP. XXII.

Section 1.

THe true ſtate of the Queſtion, concerning the Communion of the Laity, vnder one, or both kindes.

Whether vnder either kind of the Euchariſt, the Body and Bloud of Chriſt our Sauiour are truly contayned, and the true Eſſence of the Sacrament preſerued; and conſequently whether it be lawfull to adminiſter the Sacrament only vnder one kind to the Laity: or that Chriſt hath commanded both kindes to be adminiſtred vnto them. p. 537.

Section 2.

That vnder either kind is contayned whole Chriſt, to wit, Body,

Bloud, Soule and Diuinity: As alſo the true eſſence of the Sacrament. p. 542.

Section 3.

That Chriſt our Sauiour gaue no commandment of receyuing vnder both kindes, it is proued by the ſacred Scriptures, and by his owne, and his bleſſed Apoſtles examples. p. 544.

Section 4.

That Communion vnder one, or both kindes being a thing indifferent: the Church might lawfully determine the ſame: And of the reaſons that moued the Church in limitation therof. p. 547.

Section 5.

That the Ancient Fathers do expound the Scriptures in confirmation of the lawfulnes of the Adminiſtration of the B. Sacrament vnder one kind. p. 552.

Section 6.

That Prot. Writers do beleeue and teach the lawfull vſe of Adminiſtring the Euchariſt vnder one kind to the Laity. p. 553.

Section 7.

Obiections from Scripture, againſt Communion of the Euchariſt vnder one kind by the Laity, anſwered. p. 554.

CHAP. XXIII.

Section 1.

THE true ſtate of the Queſtion, concerning the Sacrifice of the Maſſe.

Whether Chriſt our Sauiour did inſtitute a true, proper, and externall Sacrifice of his Body and Bloud, to be offered vp in his Church, in Commemoration of his death and Paſſion. p. 562.

Section 2.

It is proued by Scriptures that our Sauiour inſtituted a true, proper, and externall Sacrifice of his Body and Bloud, to be offered vp in his Church to God in Commemoration of his death and Paſſion. p. 567.

Section 3.

That the Ancient Fathers expound the Scriptures agreably with Catholickes, in confirmation of the Sacrifice of the Maſſe. p. 579.

Section

OF CHAPTERS.

Section 4.

That ſundry Prot. do teach and allow a true and externall Sacrifice in the tyme of the New Teſtament, euen the Sacrifice of the Maſſe. pag. 587.

Section 5.

Obiections from Scripture againſt the Sacrifice of the Maſſe, anſwered. p. 590.

CHAP. XXIV.

Section 1.

THe true ſtate of the Queſtion, concerning the Power giuen by Chriſt to Prieſts for the forgiuenes of ſinnes: and the neceſsity of Confeſsion.

Whether Chriſt our Sauiour gaue to his Apoſtles, and in them to Biſhops, and Prieſts, true authority to forgiue and retayne Sinnes in the Sacrament of Pennance: or only to declare Sinnes to be forgiuen to thoſe that do beliewe: and whether Confeſsion of Sinnes in the ſayd Sacrament, be neceſsary. p. 595.

Section 2.

It is proued by Scriptures that Chriſt gaue to his Apoſtles, and in them to Biſhops and Prieſts, true authority to forgiue, and retayne Sinnes in the Sacrament of Pennance: And that Confeſsion of ſinnes is neceſsary. p. 601.

Section 3.

That the ancient Fathers do expound the Scriptures for the authority of Prieſts to forgiue ſinnes: and the neceſsity of Confeſsion. And that Pennance is truly a Sacrament. p. 606.

Section 4.

That Proteſtant writers do teach, that Prieſts haue authority to retayne or to forgiue Sinnes: and that Confeſsion of Sinnes in particular, is to be made to Prieſts: And that Pennance is truly a Sacrament. p. 610.

Section 5.

Obiections from Scripture againſt the Power giuen by Chriſt to Prieſt, for the remitting of ſinnes, anſwered. p. 614.

CHAP. XXV.

Section 1.

THe true State of the Queſtion, concerning punishment to be ſuffered after Remiſſion of the fault.

Whether the fault of Sinne being pardoned by the Sacrament of Pennance, the Punishment due to Sinne is alſo alwayes pardoned therwith: or whether the ſayd punishment is not afterwards to be payd, or ſatisfyed by Prayer, faſting, and Almes, and the paynes in Purgatory. p. 616.

Section 2.

It is proued by Scriptures, that temporall punishment often remayneth to be payd after the fault is remitted: and that the ſayd punishment may be taken away by the good workes of prayer, faſting, Almes, and the like. p. 620.

Section 3.

That the Fathers do expound the Scriptures in proofe of Punishment remayning after the fault pardoned: And that the ſayd Punishment is payd by workes of Pennace. p. 624.

Section 4.

That Proteſtants do agree with Catholickes in teaching that Punishment after remayneth to be payd for Sinne, the fault being remitted: and that the ſame Punishment may be ſatisfyed by good workes. p. 626.

Section 5.

Obiections from Scripture to proue that the punishment is alwaies remitted with the fault, anſwered. p. 628.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXVI.

Section 1.

The true ſtate of the Queſtion concerning Indulgences.
Whether the Church of Chriſt hath authority to grant Indulgences, or Pardons for the temporall punishment due to ſinne, the fault being formerly pardoned by the Sacraments of Pennance. p. 630.

Section 2.

It is proued by Scriptures, that the Church hath authority to grant Indulgences, or Pardons for the temporall Punishment due to ſinne, after the fault is forgiuen. p. 635.

Section 3.

That the anciens Fathers do agree with Catholicks in the Doctrine of Indulgences. p. 640.

Section 4.

Proteſtant writers teaching Indulgences. p. 641.

Section 5.

Obiections againſt Indulgences, anſwered. p. 642.

CHAP. XXVII.

Section 1.

The true ſtate of the Queſtion concerning preſcribed dayes for faſting, and Abſtinence from certaine meates.
Whether certaine daies preſcribed by the Church for Faſting: As alſo Abſtinence at ſome tymes from certaine meates, be things lawfull, and to be obſerued vnder ſinne: or rather that they are to be left free according to euery mans Deuotion, and liking. p. 645.

Section 2.

It is proued by the Scriptures, that daies preſcribed by the Church for faſting: As alſo Abſtinence at ſome tymes from certaine meates be things lawfull, and to be obſerued. p. 648.

Section

Section 3.

That the Fathers do expound the Scriptures in proofe of the lawfull Abſtinence from certaine meates, and the appointed daies for Faſting. p.650.

Section 4.

That ſundry Prot. writers do teach our Catholicke Doctrine of Abſtinence from certaine meates vpon preſcribed daies. p.652.

Section 5.

Obiections from Scripture againſt Abſtinence from certaine meates, and Preſcript faſting daies, anſwered. p.635.

CHAP. XXVIII.

Section 1.

THE true ſtate of the Queſtion, concerning Concupiſcence. Whether Concupiſcence, remayning after Baptiſme, is truly and properly ſinne, though not imputed to the faithfull: or only that it is an Effect of Originall ſinne: and corruption of nature inclyning men to ſinne. p.657.

Section 2.

It is proued by Scriptures, that Concupiſcence remayning after Baptiſme, is not truly and properly ſinne. p.659.

Section 3.

That the Fathers do expound the Scriptures in proofe that Concupiſcence remayning after Baptiſme is not properly ſinne. p.661.

Section 4.

That Prot. writers do teach that Concupiſcence without conſent is not properly ſinne. p.663.

Section 5.

Obiections taken from Scripture in proofe that Concupiſcence is properly ſinne, anſwered. p.663.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXIX.

Section 1.

THe true ſtate of the Queſtion, concerning the diſtinction of ſinne into Mortall and Veniall.

Whether all ſinnes be of their owne nature mortall and damnable; and only veniall in the Elect by Gods not imputation: or rather that there be ſome Mortall others Veniall, which of their owne nature do not deſerue Eternall Punishment, euen in the wicked, and Reprobate. p. 666.

Section 2.

It is proued by Scripture, that all ſinnes are not of their owne nature Mortall, but ſome Mortall, ſome Veniall. p. 669.

Section 3.

That the Fathers do expound the Scriptures in proofe of the difference betwene Mortall and Veniall ſinnes, p. 672.

Section 4.

That Proteſtantes teach the true difference of Mortall, and Veniall ſinnes. p. 674.

Section 5.

Obiections from Scripture againſt the difference of Mortall and Veniall ſinne, are anſwered. p. 676.

CHAP. XXX.

Section 1.

THe true ſtate of the Queſtion concerning the Author and Cauſe of ſinne.

Whether God doth will decree, predeſtinate counſaile, or compell men to ſinne, & to be damned, or only permitteth the ſame; and that

man himselfe is Cause of his owne sinne and damnation: and whether Christ dyed for all men, or only for the Predestinate. p. 678.

Section 2.

It is proued by Scriptures, that God doth not Predestinate, will, decree, counsaile, or compell men to sinne or to be damned, but only permitteth the same: And that Christ dyed not only for the Predestinate, but for all men whatsoeuer. p. 683.

Section 3.

That the Fathers expound the Scriptures in proofe, that God doth not will, or command sinne: And that Christ dyed for all. p. 687.

Section 4.

That Prot. writers do teach the same doctrine with Catholickes, against God being the Author of sinne, or damnation. p. 689.

Section 5.

Reasons to proue that God doth not will, command, or inforce men to sinne, or to be damned, but that he only permitteth the same. p. 692.

Section 6.

Obiections from Scripture in proofe that God is the Author of sinne, and decreeth the sinne or damnation of man, answered. p. 696.

CHAP. XXXI.

Section 1.

THe true state of the Question, concerning Freewill.

Whether man after Adams fall, hath Freewill with Gods Grace, to do such things as belong to Saluation, and not to do them: or whether

whether the will concurreth only as a naturall Inſtrument of God, and not as a free Cauſe. p.705.

Section 2.

It is proued by Scriptures, that man after Adams fall, hath freewill with Gods Grace, to do good, and eſchew euill. p.709.

Section 3.

That the Fathers do expound the Scriptures agreably with Catholickes, in proofe of Freewill. p.714.

Section 4.

That ſundry Prot. Writers do teach, and defend our Catholicke doctrine of Freewill. p 717.

Section 5.

Obiections from Scripture againſt Freewill, anſwered. p.718.

CHAP. XXXII.

Section 1.

THe true ſtate of the Queſtion, concerning the poſsibility of keeping Gods Commandements.

Whether the Commandements of God, through his holy Grace, though not by the only power of freewill, are poſsible to be kept by iuſt men in this lyfe: or rather that they are ſo impoſsible, that in euery worke that men do, they tranſgreſſe them. p.721.

Section 2.

It is proued by Scriptures that the Commandements of God through his holy Grace are poſsible to be kept by man in this lyfe. p.726.

Section 3.

The Fathers do expound the Scriptures in proofe that the Commandements are possible to be kept. p.729.

Section 4.

Protestants teach, that the Commandementes of God are possible to be kept. p.731.

Section 5.

Obiections from Scripture in proofe, that it is impossible to keep Gods Commandements, answered. p.732.

CHAP. XXXIII.

Section 1.

THe true state of the Question, concerning the best workes of the Iust being Sinne.

Whether all the workes of the Iust, euen the best, are in themselues and of their owne nature truly sinnes, and deseruing damnation: Or rather, that they are truly and properly iust and good. p.733.

Section 2.

It is proued by Scriptures that all the workes of the Iust are not sinne, nor deseruing damnation. p.735.

Section 3.

That the Ancient Fathers do expound the Scriptures in proofe that the works of the iust are truly good, and not sinne. p.737.

Section 4.

That Prot. Writers do teach that the workes of the iust are truly good, and not sinne. p.738.

Section

OF CHAPTERS.

Section 5.

Obiections from Scripture, in proofe that the workes of the iuſt are truly ſinne, anſwered. p. 739.

CHAP. XXXIV.

Section 1.

THe true ſtate of the Queſtion, concerning the infallible knowledge of our Predeſtination and Saluation.

Whether man in this world without ſpeciall Reuelation from God, can haue infallible knowledge of his preſent Iuſtification, Predeſtination, and Eternall Saluation: In ſo much, that euery one is bound as firmly to beleeue his owne Saluation as he doth the Articles of his Creed: Or only that in this world a morall certainty can be had therof: And whether true Faith and Iuſtice once had, may be loſt. p. 741.

Section 2.

It is proued by Scripture, that man in this world without ſpecial Reuelation from God cannot haue infallible knowledge of his preſent Iuſtification, Predeſtination, and eternall Saluation: And that true faith and iuſtice once had, may be loſt. p. 745.

Section 3.

The ſacred Scriptures expounded by the Fathers agreably with Catholickes in proofe of our vncertainty of our Predeſtination and Saluation: as alſo in proofe that faith & iuſtice once had, may be loſt. p. 751.

Section 4.

That ſundry Prot. do teach from the ſacred Scriptures the vncertainty of our Predeſtination and Saluation: and that faith and iuſtice once had, may be loſt. p. 753.

Section 5.

Obiections from Scripture in proofe of our certainty of Predeſtination, and Saluation, and that faith and Iuſtice cannot be loſt, anſwered. p. 755.

CHAP. XXXV.

Section 1.

THE *true ſtate of the Queſtion, concerning the formall Cauſe of Iuſtification.*

Whether the formall cauſe of Mans Iuſtification is any vertue or grace infuſed by God, and inherens in the ſoule: Or that it conſiſteth only in Chriſts not imputation of ſinne; or in the only remiſſion of ſinne, without any infuſion of grace. p. 762.

Section 2.

It is proued by Scriptures that the formall cauſe of mans Iuſtification is true vertue and Grace inherent: and that it doth not conſiſt only in Chriſts not imputation of ſinne, or in the only remiſſion of ſinne. p. 766.

Section 3.

That the Fathers do expound the Scriptures in proofe of inherent Iuſtice. p. 768.

Section 4.

That Prot. Writers do teach the doctrine of inherent Iuſtice. p. 769.

Section 5.

Obiections from Scripture againſt inherent Iuſtice, anſwered. p. 770.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXXVI.

Section 1.

The true ſtate of the Queſtion, concerning Iuſtification by Faith and Workes.

Whether man is truly iuſtifyed by faith only, or that Hope, Charity, and good workes, are likewiſe cauſes of Iuſtification. p. 772.

Section 2.

It is proued by the ſacred Scriptures, that not only faith, but likewiſe Hope, Charity, and other good Works do truly iuſtify, and cauſe remiſsion of ſinne. p. 775.

Section 3.

The Fathers expound the ſacred Scriptures in proofe of Iuſtification not only by faith, but likewiſe by workes: As alſo that true faith may be without workes. p. 781.

Section 4.

That ſundry Prot. do teach our doctrine of Iuſtification by workes, and not only by faith. p. 783.

Section 5.

Obiections taken from Scripture in proofe of Iuſtification by only faith, and not by workes, anſwered. p. 784.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXXVII.

Section 1.

THE true ſtate of the Queſtion, concerning Merit of Workes. Whether Workes proceeding from Faith and Charity, do truly merit increaſe of Grace and Glory. p. 788.

Section 2.

It is proued by Scriptures, that workes proceeding from Faith and Charity, do truly merit increaſe of Grace and Glory. p. 792.

Section 3.

The Fathers do expound the Scriptures in proofe of merit of workes. p. 793.

Section 4.

That Proteſtant writers teach our Catholicke Doctrine of merit of workes. p. 797.

Section 5.

Obiections from Scriptures againſt merit of Workes, anſwered. p. 798.

A PRE-

A PREPARATIVE TO THE TRIPLE CORD.

WHEREIN

Is proued the Dignity & Infallibility of the written Word of God, or Sacred Scriptures: As also the necessity of finding out their true sense intended by the Holy Ghost: With certaine infallible Rules for the finding out of the sayd Sense.

SECT. I.

The true State of the Question, concerning the verity of the Sacred Scriptures.

Whether the Scriptures contained in the Bible be the word of God himselfe truly Diuine and Infallible in euery least parcell or text ther-of? And therefore for such are by all the faythfull to be receaued, beliued, and obeyed.

Catholike Doctrine.

SACRED Scripture being a principall ground of Christian fayth and Religion, the dignity and infallible truth thereof must necessarily be acknowledged; and therfore the Catholike Church (1) *Receaueth and honoureth with like affect & of Piety and reuerence all the bookes as well of*

(1) *Conc. Trid sess. 4. Decret. de Canonicis Scripturis.*

the Old at New Teſtament, ſeeing one God is Authour of both &c.

(2) *Decret. 4.* (3) *Rhem. Teſt. in Gal. 6.*

The Councell Senonenſe decreeth, that (2) *Great hath been & euer is to be the Authority of ſacred Scripture, in which nothing can be falſe, nothing idle.* Our Catholike Doctours teach, that (3) *The Scriptures which are indeed wholly of the holy Ghoſts indyting, being put to the Churches tryall, are found proued, and teſtifyed vnto the world to be ſuch, and not made true, altered, and amended by the ſame. Without which atteſtation of the Church, the holy Scriptures in themſelues, were alwayes true before, but not ſo knowne to be to all Chriſtians, nor they ſo bound to take them.* Cardinall Bellarmine

(4) *De verbo Dei l. 1. c. 2.*

proueth ſeuerall wayes, that the (4) Canonicall Bookes of Scripture are the word of God. So that according to Catholikes, there is not any one Sentence or text of Scripture which we are not bound to belieue for moſt true & diuine.

Proteſtant Doctrine.

(5) Harm. of Confeſſ. p. 1.

(6) *Ibid. pag. 3*

Some Prot. (5) *belieue & confeſſe the Canonicall Scriptures of the holy Prophets, and Apoſtles of both Teſtaments, to be the very true word of God &c.* And they (6) *deteſt all the hereſies of Artemon, the Manichees, Valentinians, of Cerdon, and the Marcioniſtes, who denyed that the Scriptures proceeded from the holy Ghoſt, or els receaued not, or &c. corrupted ſome of them.*

(7) See heerafter Chap. 1. Sect. 1. fig 51.

(8) *Luth. tom. 3. V Vttemb. in Pſalm. 45. f. 422. 422. & tom. 3. Ger. f. 40. 41.*

(9) *Swingl. tom. 2. conf. Anabap. f. 10.*

(10) *V Vbitak. de Eccl. cont. Bel. Controu. 2. q 4. pag. 223. Fulke ag. the Rhem. Teſt. in Gal. 2. f. 322.*

Others of more ſublimated ſpirits do ſo little eſteeme of the written Word, that they affirme the (7) *Old Teſtament and the New to be contrary and to fight altogeather.* Others vtterly reiect (8) Moyſes and his writings, as being (as they conceit) *in the ſight of God either Idolatry, or Hipocriticall wiſdome.* Others (9) charge *the Anabaptiſtes with ignorance, for that they thinke the Commentaries of the Euangeliſts, and the Epiſtles of the Apoſtles, to haue bene then in Authority, when Paul did write theſe things, as though Paul did attribute ſo much to his Epiſtles, that whatſoeuer was contained in them was ſacred &c. Which thing* (ſayth Swinglius) *were to attribute immoderate arrogancy to the Apoſtle.* (10) Others condemne *S. Peter to haue erred in matters of fayth, euen after the Holy Ghoſtes deſcending vpon the Apoſtles.* But theſe things omitted, how then can we be ſecure that the Euangeliſtes and Apoſtles were the Scribes of the holy Ghoſt, and erred not alſo in their writings?

And

And if it be true which *D. Fulke* ſayth, (11) *Whoſoeuer denieth the authority of the holy Scriptures, thereby bewrayeth himſelfe to be an hereticke*; what is then to be thought of Luther, Whitaker, Swinglius, Fulke himſelfe, and ſundry other Proteſtantes, who thus impudently detract from the authority of Moyſes, the Euangeliſtes, the Apoſtles, and their writings.

(11) *In Confut. of Purgat. p.* 214.

SECT. II.

That the ſacred Scriptures are the true word of God, diuine & infallible, the Scriptures themſelues do teſtify.

I Do not intend theſe prooſes from Scriptures with any expectation that they ſhould be approued by ſuch as reiect their authority, relying only vpon their priuate Spirits, but only in this regard, that the world may know, that we Catholikes do ſo highly eſteeme them for diuine and infallible, as whatſoeuer is ſpoken, taught, or to be read therin, we in all Diſputes and Controuerſies of Religion, do humbly ſubmit our ſelues to the doctrine thereof.

Firſt then we beleiue that the Author of the Scriptures, is only God himſelfe, dictating them to his Prophets, Euangeliſtes, and Apoſtles, as his Scribes; of whom *S. Peter* affirmeth that, (1) *The holy men of God ſpake, inſpired with the Holy Ghoſt*. And S. Paul affirmeth that, (2) *All Scripture inſpired by God is profitable to teach &c.* Agreably to which the Prophets were ſaid to be *the mouth of our Lord*: (3) *The mouth of our Lord hath ſpoken.* (4.) *As he ſpoke by the mouth of his holy Prophets, that are from the beginning.* (5) *In tymes paſt God ſpeaking to the Fathers in the Prophets, laſt of all in theſe dayes hath ſpoken to vs in his Son.* This ſpeach whether vttered by the Prophets, or by Chriſt himſelfe, is here ſaid to proceed from God, as the firſt Author. And ſo God is ſaid to ſpeake by the mouth of man, & the Prophets and other ſacred writers by the mouth of God. And wheras Moiſes writeth that (6) *God ſaid to Pharao*, S. Paul relating the ſame thing writeth that, *The* (7) *Scripture ſayth to Pharao*: ſo making Gods ſpeaking and the Scriptures ſpeaking all one. And to the ſame purpoſe ſpeaketh *S. Paul* of him-

(1) 2. Pet. 1. 21.
(2) 2. Tim. 3. 16.
(3) Iſa. 1. 20.
(4) Luc. 1. 70.
(5) Heb. 1. 1.
(6) Exod. 9. 16.
(7) Rom. 9. 17.

himselfe, (8) *Seeke you an experiment of him, that speaketh in me, Christ?* Yea the selfesame writings are said to be written by God, & by Moises. So God said to Moises, (9) *Cut thee two tables of stone like vnto the former, and I will write vpon them the words which the tables had, which thou hast broken.* (10) *And he wrote in the tables according as he had written before, the 10. wordes. and yet* (11) *our Lord said to Moises, write thou these words &c. And he wrote in the Tables the words of the Couenant, ten.* Now how could the Tables of the law be said to be written by God & by Moises, but that Moises as a scholler did hould the pen, and God as maister did direct, that so all that writing might be ascribed to Moises as the Instrument, and to God as the chiefe author.

(8) 2. Cor. 13. 3.
(9) Exod. 34. 1. Deut. 10. 2. 4.
(10) Deut 10. 4.
(11) Exod. 34. 27. 28.

A further proofe heerof may be taken from the frequent practise of the holy men of God, who vsually confirmed their callings, as also the Doctrine which they wrote or preached by testimonies of the Scripture. So S. Iohn Baptiste alleadged the Prophet Isay as a witnesse of his Embassage, for being asked who he was, he answered, (12) *I am the voyce of one crying in the desert, make straight the way of our Lord, as Isay the Prophet said.* The Apostles Peter, Paul, Iohn, Iames, Iude, in all their Epistles do frequently alleadge the testimonies of the law and Prophets. Yea Christ himselfe first of all confirmed his owne Embassage by testimony of the Prophet Esay saying, (13) *The spirit of the Lord vpon me, for which he annointed me &c.* He confuteth the Saduces out of the Scriptures, when he said, (14.) *Do you not therfore erre, not knowing the Scriptures?* And a little after, *As concerning the dead that they do ryse againe, haue you not read in the booke of Moises &c?* Finally he (15) confuteth the Pharisees by the testimony of Dauid, and directeth them thus, (16) *Search the Scriptures for you thinke in them to haue life Euerlasting, and the same are they that giue testimony of me.* This alleadging of the Scriptures by the Prophets, Apostles, and Christ himselfe in proofe of their Callings and Doctrine, doth cleerly suppose their diuine infallibility.

(12) Io. 1. 23. Esa. 40. 3.
(13) Luc. 4. 18. Esa. 61. 1.
(14) Mar. 12. 24. 26.
(15) Mat. 22. 41. Psal 109. 1.
(16) Io. 5. 39.

SECT.

SECT. III.

That the Ancient Fathers do teach and beliue the Sacred Scriptures to be the true word of God, of diuine, and infallible Authoritie.

THE Ancient Fathers teach, that the ſacred Scriptures are Letters, or Epiſtles ſent from God to man. So S. Chriſoſtome, (1) *God from the beginning ſpoke with man by himſelf for ſo he came to Adam, ſo he blamed Cain, ſo he ſpoke with Noë, ſo he lodged with Abrahã. But after all mankind had degenerated into great malice, neither then did the maker of all withdraw himſelfe wholly from mankind but willing to renew his friendſhip with them, he ſent letters as to men abſent, to reconcile vnto him all men, and theſe Letters God gaue, but Moiſes brought them.* S. Auſtine affirmeth that, (2) *Letters came to vs from that Citie* (to wit Heauen) *where we are Strangers: they are the Scriptures, which do exhort vs to liue well.* And againe, (3) *The diuine Scriptures, are as Letters ſent to vs from our Country. Becauſe our King more pious and mercifull then can be thought or ſpoken, hath vouchſafed to ſend vnto vs by Patriarches and Prophetes the diuine inuiting Scriptures, by which he would inuite vs to our eternall Country.* (4) *What is ſacred Scripture* (ſaith S. Gregory) *but a certaine Epiſtle of Almighty God to his Creature?*

(1) *Ham. 1. in Gen.*

(2) *In Pſ. 90.*

(3) *Ser. 16. ad frat. in Eremo.*

(4) *L. 4. Epiſt. Ep. 84.*

S. Auſtine teacheth, that Chriſt God and man (5) *Spoke firſt by the Prophets, then by himſelfe, after by the Apoſtles as much as he iudged ſufficient: yea he made a writing* (or Scripture) *which is called Canonicall, of moſt eminent Authority, which we beliene of theſe things, which it is not expedient to be ignorant of, nor are able of our ſelues to know.* And writing to S. Hierome, (6) *I acknowledge* (ſaith he) *to thy Charity that I haue learned to giue that feare and honour to thoſe bookes onely of the Scriptures, which are now called Canonicall, that I moſt firmely beliene no Author of them to haue erred any thing in writing. And if I ſhall find any thing in theſe writings, which ſeemeth contrary to truth, I will nothing doubt, but that either the Booke is corrupted, or that the Interpreter hath not conceiued what is ſpoken, or that my ſelfe doth not vnderſtand it.* So Religious a reſpect did S. Auſtine beare to the Scriptures. Yea he conſtantly

(5) *De ciuit. Dei. l. 11. c 3.*

(6) *Ep. 19.*

ſtantly auoucheth that, (7) *faith it ſelfe will ſtragger, if the authority of diuine Scriptures do not ſtand ſure.* In which reſpect preferring it before all the writings of men, he further ſaith: (8) *Who knoweth not, that the holy Canonicall Scripture as well of the old as new Teſtament is contained in its owne certaine Bounds, and that the ſame is ſo to be preferred before all the later writings of Biſhopes, that no doubt or diſputation may be had thereof, whether it be true or right, whatſoeuer ſhall appeare to be written therin.* Thus S. Auſtine, and thus all Catholikes at this day.

(7) *De doct. Chriſt. l. 1. c. 37.*
(8) *De Bapt. Cont. Don. l. 2. c. 3.*

SECT. IV.

That Sundry Proteſtants doe acknowledge the ſacred Scriptures to be the word of God, of diuine and infallible authority.

MAny Proteſtãts ſeeme to giue ſo much credit vnto the ſacred Scriptures, as that they pretend to beliue nothing for certaine, but the holy Scriptures only. So M. Willet teacheth that, (1) *The Scripture is not one of the meanes, but the ſole, whole, and only meanes to worke faith.* And agreably our Engliſh Church hath decred that the (2) *Holy ſcripture cõtaineth all things neceſſary to Saluation: So that whatſoeuer is not read therin, nor may be proued therby, is not to be required of any man, that it ſhould be beliued as an Article of the faith, or be thought requiſite or neceſſary to Saluation.* The Heluetian reformed Church ordaineth that, (3) *In Controuerſies of Religion or matters of faith, we cannot admit any other Iudge then God himſelfe, pronouncing by the holy Scriptures what is true, what is falſe, what is to be followed, or what to be auoyded.* And againe, (4) *The Canonicall Scripture being the word of God, and deliuered by the holy Ghoſte, and publiſhed to the world by the Prophets and Apoſtles, being of all other the moſt perfect and ancient Philoſophy, doth alone perfectly containe all Piety &c.* (5) The Bohemiã Miniſters teach with one cõſent, *cõcerning the holy Scriptures of the new & old Teſtament, which is cõmonly called the Byble &c. that it is true, certaine, and worthy to be beliued &c It is inſpired and taught of the holy Ghoſt, and vttered by the mouth of holy men, written by them, and confirmed by heauenly and*

(1) Syuop. p. 38
(2) *Art. 6.*
(3) In the Harm of Confeſſ p. 4.
(4) *Ibid. p. 5.*
(5) In the Harm. pa. 6.

and diuine teſtimonies &c. (6) *Wherfore euery one ought very highly to eſteeme of the diuine writings of the holy Prophets and Apoſtles, reſolutely to beleeue them, and religiouſly to yield vnto them in all things.* (6) *Ib. p. 7.*

The French Proteſt. auouch, (7) *That God reueiled himſelfe &c. farre more plainly in his word: which word in the begining he reueiled to the fathers by certaine viſions and Oracles, and then cauſed it to be written in theſe Bookes we call holy Scripture. All this holy Scripture is contayned in the Canonicall Bookes of the old and new Teſtament.* (7) *Harm. pa. 8. 9.*

And then making the Catalogue therof, they ſay, *we acknowledge theſe Bookes to be Canonicall, that is, we account them as the Rule and ſquare of our faith &c. and we beleeue that the Word contained in theſe bookes, came from one God &c.* The Prot. of Belgia (8) confeſſe that, *this word of God was not brought or deliuered by any will of man, but that holy men of God inſpired by Gods ſpirit ſpake it, as S. Peter witneſſeth &c.* (8) *Harm pa. 10.*

And they (9) *without any doubt beleeue alſo thoſe things, which are contained in them &c. As alſo that this holy Scripture doth moſt perfectly contayne the will of God, and that in it all things are abundantly taught, whatſoeuer is neceſſary to be beleeued of man to attaine ſaluation.* (9) *Ib p. 11.*

The Prot. of Wittemberge ſay, (10) *This Scripture we beleeue and confeſſe to be the Oracle of the Holy Ghoſt, ſo confirmed by heauenly Teſtimonies, that if an Angel from heauen preach any other thing, let him be accurſed.* (10) *Ib. p. 13.*

The Prot. of Scotland decree thus: (11) *As we beleeue and confeſſe the Scriptures of God ſufficient to inſtruct, and make the man of God prefect; ſo doe we affirme and auow the authority of the ſame to be of God, and neither to depend on men or Angels.* (11) *Harm. p. 19.*

In regard of theſe premiſſes and ſundry other ſuch like acknowledgments, D Fulke inferreth and concludeth as before, that (12) *whoſoeuer denyeth the Authority of the Holy Scriptures, therby bewraieth himſelfe to be an heretike.* (12) *Againſt Purgat. pag. 214.*

And in this truth all Catholikes doe accord with D. Fulke.

SECT. V.

That it is impious to corrupt, or reiect any part of Canonicall Scripture.

ALL ſides agree, that it is moſt impious to corrupt the wordes, or true ſenſe of Scripture, by adding, or ſubtracting,

tracting, mistranslating, or false interpreting; this being, as S. Paul saith, *to adulterate the word of God*: and these Corrupters according to Origen, are, (2) *Theeues and adulterers of the Scriptures.* And S. Cyprian calleth them, (3) *false Interpreters, artificers, & craftsmaisters in corrupting the truth.* The ancient Heretikes were obserued by the (4) Fathers, to be often guilty of this haynous crime, but none more frequently & palpably then our moderne Prot. haue offended herin, as will cleerly appeare vpon sundry occasions in this Treatise following. But this they haue learned from their first Father Martin Luther, to whom Swinglius said, (5) *Thou dost corrupt the word of God, thou art seene to be a manifest and common corrupter and peruerter of the holy Scriptures: how much are we ashamed of thee, who haue hitherto esteemed thee beyond all measure, & now proue thee to be such a man.* Wheras on the other side, for speciall reuerence & sincerity of dealing in those matters, the Fathers and Catholike expositors are those whom S. Paul stileth (6) *Right handlers of the word of truth:* These making Conscience and esteeming it most sacrilegious to corrupt, alter, adde, or subtract the least word or sillable indited by the holy Ghost, & written in the booke of God.

(1) 2. Cor. 4 2.
(2) In Rom. 2.
(3) De Vnit. Eccl. in. 7.
(4) Iren. l. 1. c. 2.
(5) Swingl. tom 2. ad Luth. l. de Sacram. p. 412. 413.
(6) 2. Tim. 2. 15.

It is no lesse criminall to deny or reiect the sacred Scriptures when they seeme to make against them: which S. Hierome obserueth to be the custome of ancient heretikes, who, (7) *whatsoeuer they saw contrary to their opinion, they either scraped out, or reiected the whole.* Or, as S. Austine saith of them, (8) *That which doth not hinder their heresy, that they receiue: but that which hindreth, that they receiue not.* So the Manichees denyed all the old Testament, and many parts of the new, as S. Austine (9) witnesseth; the Nicolaites and Gnostikes discarded out of the Canon the Psalter, as Philastrius (10) testifieth. The Ebionites plainly reiected the Ghospell of S. Mathew, as S. Epiphanius (11) recordeth: And (12) according to Eusebius, they made smal account of the rest of the Ghospels. Marcion receiued only the Ghospell of S. Luke, as Tertullian (13) and Irenæus auouch: And the same maimed in aboue 20. places, as S. Epiphanius proueth, and confuteth. The Alogians contemned the Ghospell of S. Iohn, and the Apocalyps,

(7) In Proam. Comment. in ep ad Tit.
(8) L. 18 cont. Faust. Man. c 7.
(9) Hær. 46. & cont. Faust. l. 3. & 31.
(10) L. de hæres c. 117.
(11) Hær. 30.
(12) L. 3. c. 21.
(13) L. de Præscrip. Iren. l. c. 29.
(14) Hær. 42.

lyps, witneſſe *Epiphanius*. (15) The Seuerians admitted not the Actes of the Apoſtles, as *Euſebius* (16) declareth, & the ſame affirmeth *S. Auſtine* (17) of the Manichees. The Ebionites reiected all the Epiſtles of *S. Paul*, as witneſſe *S. Irenæus* (18) and *S. Epiphanius*. Now that our moderne Prot. doe no little offend in this kind of reiecting the Scriptures, whē they ſeeme to make againſt them, I ſhall ſundry wayes make cleere, in this (19) ſubſequent Treatiſe.

(15) *Hær* 51.
(16) *L.* 4. *c.* 27.
(17) *L. de vtil. lit. cred c.* 2.
(18) *L.* 2. *c.* 28. *Epiph. hær.* 30.
(19) See hereafter.

SECT. VI.

The neceſsity of finding out the true Senſe of the ſacred Scriptures.

SEeing all things naturally deſire that which is good, and the mind cannot incline to any euill, which may withdraw the vnderſtanding or the will frō that which is right, vnles it be vnder the pretext and colour of that which is true & good; euen as the Deuill to deceyue men, (1) *doth transfigure himſelfe into an Angell of light*: So in matter of faith, nothing being more true thē the ſacred Scriptures, all heretikes vnder the ſpecious title of the Scriptures, do deceiue others and are deceiued themſelues. Now becauſe falſhood cannot receiue proofe from truth, and Scripture rightly vnderſtood can produce or nourish no errour; therfore from Scriptures falſely vnderſtood doe all Heretikes defend themſelues and their cauſe. But againſt this fraud Chriſt himſelfe forwarneth vs, (2) *to take great heede of falſe Prophets, which come in the cloathing of ſheep, but inwardly are rauening wolues*. This cloathing of ſheep are the words of the Prophets and Apoſtles, pretended by heretikes, but inwardly, that is, in the Senſe of the words, they are reuening wolues and robbers of Soules. To which purpoſe ſaith moſt excellently the eloquent Vincent, (3) *what is the cloathing of ſheep, but the ſentences of Prophets and Apoſtles? Who are the rauening wolues, but the wild and rauenous ſenſes of heretiks, who alwaies trouble the foulds of the Church, and teare in peaces the flocke of Chriſt by what meanes they can? But that they may more deceiptfully ſteale vpon the vnwary ſheepe, the cruelty of wolues remayning, they caſt of the ſhape of wolues, and wrappe them-*

(1) 2. *Cor.* 11.
(2) *Mat.* 7. 15.
(3) *L. Cont. proph. hær. Nouitates. c.* 36.

thẽselues within the sentences of Gods law, as within certaine fleeces of sheep. In like sort wheras our Sauiour biddeth vs not to be-
(4) *Mat.* 24. 23. lieue false Prophets who wil cry, (4) *Lo heer is Christ, or there,* old Origen expoundeth this of heretikes detorting the Scrip-
(5) *In Mat. hom.* 29 tures: (5) *He that would deceiue vs saith, Behold heere is Christ, shewing for example this place of the Gospell: but the Author of another error will say, Behold Christ is heere, offering for example another text.* So that the text of Scripture is made to serue the turne of all heretiks, though neuer so opposite one to another: Euery one,
(6) 2. *Pet.* 3. 16. as S. Peter saith, (6) *deprauing the Scriptures to their owne perdition.*

(7) *Tract.* 18. *in Ioan.* In this respect it is, that the sacred Scriptures are said to be the bookes of Hereticks. *Heresies* (saith S. Austine) *and certaine opinions insnaring the soules of the peruerse, and plunging them into the depth* (of Errour) *haue no other roote but when Scriptures are not well vnderstood, and what is not wel vnderstood in them, is also rashly and audaciously defended.* Yea, (8) *They are Heretickes*
(8) *De Gen. & lit. l.* 7. *c.* 9. *for no other cause, but because not rightly vnderstanding the Scriptures, they obstinatly maintaine their false opinions, against the truth of them.* And according to S. Hilary, (9) *Heresy is* (or aryseth)
(9) *L.* 2. *de Trinit. & l. de Synodis extremo.* *of the vnderstanding not of the Scripture* (it selfe,) *the fault is in the sense, not in the wordes.* And then naming diuers Heretickes, he sayth, *they all speake Scriptures without sense, they all pretend sayth, without faith: for the Scriptures are not in the reading, but in the vnderstanding.* Agreably to which, Christ our Lord repro-
(10) *Mat.* 22. 29. ued the Sadduces in these words: (10) *You do erre, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God.* The Sadduces did read the texte of Scripture, but therfore they are said *to erre*, because they did not know, that is, they did not vnderstand the Scripture: teaching therby that the cause of Error, is the not right vnderstanding, although we haue the wordes vpon our fingers ends.

(11) *L.* 1. *c.* 2. *S. Irenæus* (11) disputing against heretickes auoucheth that their monstrous Doctrines and phantasies of opinion, are wholly framed of Scriptures not well ioyned together; As if a man should breake asunder the Kings Image made of precious stones, and changing the figure, should make therof Foxes & Lions, and by reason of the identity of the matter,

ter, ſhould endeauour to perſuade the ſimple, that this is the true Image of the king: ſuch like monſters make Heretickes of the word of God it ſelfe. This is ſo certaine a truth, that D. Luther himſelfe auoucheth that, (12) *It is true that the ſacred Scripture is the booke of Heretickes, becauſe Heretickes are accuſtomed to prouoke to that booke: neither did there aryſe at any time any Hereſy ſo peſtiferous, and ſo foolish, which did not endeauour to hyde it ſelfe vnder the veile of Scripture.*

(12) *In Poſtil. VVitt. in 2. con. S. Dom. poſt Trinit. fol. 118.*

That then, which importeth for the final and Infallible deciding of Controuerſies aryſing from the Scripture, is to fynd out the true ſenſe therof intended by the holy Ghoſt: to which all parties will proteſſe without any tergiuerſation to yield and ſubſcribe. And ſo preſcribed S. Hierome, (13) *Let vs not thinke* (ſayth he) *that the Ghoſpel is in the wordes of Scripture, but in the ſenſe, not in the ſuperficies, but in the marrow, not in the leaues of words, but in the roote of reaſon.* Againe, (14) *Then the Scripture is profitable to the hearers, when it is not expounded without Chriſt* (that is to ſay, *not contrary to the Rule of fayth deliuered by Chriſt to his Church &c.*) *otherwiſe the Diuel which alleadgeth Scriptures, and all heretickes* (*according to Ezechiel*) *of Scriptures make Cuſhions which they may put vnder the elbow of men of all ages.* Wherfore S. Auſtine aduiſeth wel, (15) *Loue exceedingly the vnderſtanding, becauſe the Scriptures themſelues, except they be rightly vnderſtood, cannot be profitable vnto thee.* Tertullian telleth vs, (16) *That the ſenſe of holy Scripture adulterated, doth impugne the truth, as much as the ſtyle corrupted.* And anſwerably hetunto Prot. themſelues teach, that (17) *It is not the ſhew, but the ſenſe of words* (of Scripture) *that muſt decyde controuerſies.* Now how this true ſenſe is to be found without all Error and deceipt, theſe few Sections next following will cleerly diſcouer.

(13) *In Comment. ad Gal. 2.*

(14) *In c. 1. ad Gal. Ep. ad Nepot. & in l. 3. reg. c. 1.*

(15) *Ep. 222.*

(16) *De præſcript. c. 17.*

(17) Rainolds in his Confer. p. 48.

SECT. VII.

That the ſacred Scriptures do admit ſeuerall true and different ſenſes, but not contrary, as wel Literall as Myſticall: & of the force of ſuch Arguments as are taken from any of the forſaid ſenſes.

(1) L. 21. mor. c. 1.

SAint Gregory (1) teacheth that, It is a thing proper to the ſacred Scriptures, hauing God for their Author, to be of that fecundity, as to affoard ſeueral true ſenſes, in one & the ſame ſentence, as the literall or hiſtorical, and the ſpiritual or myſtical. The literal is that which the words of themſelues do immediatly beare: the ſpiritual relateth to ſome thing elſe, then that which the words do immediatly ſignify. The literal againe is twofold, the one ſimple or plaine, which conſiſteth in the propriety of wordes: the other figuratiue, wherby the wordes are transferred from their natiue ſignification to another: and of this there be ſo many kinds, as there are ſeueral kinds of figures. The ſpiritual ſenſe alſo is deuided into Allegoricall, Tropologicall, and Anagogical. Now of theſe ſenſes, the literall is found to be in euery Text both of the Old and New Teſtament: And though the Spiritual be often to be had in both Teſtaments, yet not in euery ſentence of both. So thoſe wordes, Thou ſhalt loue thy Lord thy God with all thy hart, haue but one ſenſe, and that is Literal. Theſe things ſuppoſed, that which may ſeeme ſomwhat queſtionable, is, whether one Text of Scripture may admit ſeuerall true & different Senſes, either literal or ſpiritual? In which though I fynd (2) D. Fulke and M. Willet to hold the Negatiue; yet S. Auſtine (3) proueth by many examples, that in one ſentence may often be found ſeueral true literall ſenſes. And further ſayth, (4) *When one ſhal ſay, Moyſes meant that which I do, and another, nay that which I do; I thinke I ſpeake more religiouſly, why not rather both, if both be true? Or if any third or fourth, or any other truth any man ſhall ſee in theſe wordes; why may not he be thought to haue ſeene all thoſe truthes, by whom God, to thoſe that ſee*

(2) Fulk ag. Purg. pa. 151. Will. in Synop. p. 16.

(3) L. 12. Confeſſ. c. 20. & 23. 27. 31. l. 3. de doct. Chriſt. c. 27. l. 11. de Ciu. Dei. c. 19.

(4) L. 12. Confeſſ. c. 31.

true

true and diuerſe things, hath tempered the Scriptures with many ſenſes? In another place he affirmeth, that ſuch is the Scriptures obſcurity, that (5) *It bringeth forth diuers ſenſes of truth &c. whiles one vnderſtandeth it after this manner, another after that.* (6) *Yea one text of Scripture may wel haue ſo many vnderſtandings, as may ſtand with truth, and be not repugnant to lyfe and good maners.* And the like he teacheth in ſundry other places. And indeed it is the general Doctrine of the Anciẽt Fathers.

A truth ſo euident that ſundry Prot. writers do teach the ſame. *Zanchius* auoucheth that, (8) *Beſydes the literal Senſe, the Allegorical ſenſe is often needful: to which are reduced the Anagogical, and Tropological, or Moral ſenſe; and that theſe are deliuered from the Holy Ghoſt: and are ſometymes collected as pertayning to fayth or to manners, and according to the mynd of the Holy Ghoſt.* The Tranſlatour of the Bible into Engliſh publiſhed Anno 1576. ſpeaking of the diuerſity of Tranſlations, ſayth, (9) *Seeing ſome Tranſlations read after one ſort, and ſome after another, wheras all may ſerue to good purpoſe and edification, we haue in the Margent noted that diuerſity of ſpeach or reading; which may alſo ſeeme agreable to the mynd of the Holy Ghoſt.* Arerius thinketh, (10) *As concerning the variable Expoſition of Scripture, it is light which they* (the Anabaptiſtes) *do obiect: for they ought to conſider that the Guiſtes in the Church be diuerſe, namly in Interpretation, wherin whiles the Rule of fayth and ſincerity be obſerued, there is no cauſe why the diuerſity of opinions ſhould hurt.* And ſomewhat before he ſayth, (11) *Concerning the variable interpretation* (of the Scriptures) *I affirme euery one to enioy their ſeueral Guift, and do ſomtymes profitably vary: And that ſo long as it is not erred from the ſcope of fayth, we ought not to be offended with the diuerſity of interpretation.* But to alleadge many witneſſes in one, the Prot. of Geneua in their *Principles of diuinity propounded and diſputed by certaine Students there*, vnder M. Theodore Beza, and M. Anthony Faius, and by them publiſhed, affirme and teach that, (12) *The Scripture is ſo plentiful, that one and the ſelfeſame place can admit diuers Interpretations, and yet all agreable with the Doctrine of fayth.* So that both Scriptures, Fathers, and Prot. do all teach this Catholicke Doctrine, that the wordes and ſentences of Scripture do contayne in them ſeuerall diffe-

(5) *De Ciu. Dei. l.* 11. *c.* 19.
(6) *L.* 12. *Conf.* 1. *& de Gen. ad lit. l.* 1. *c* 21. *de doct. Chr. l.* 2. *c.* 36. *de Ciu. Dei. l.* 13 *c.* 16. *de vtil. cred. c.* 3.
(7) *Orig. in Gen. ho* 11. *Greg. Mor. l.* 20. *c.* 1. *Chriſoſt. ho* 22 *in Gen. Pulg. l.* 2. *C. ad Monim. c.* 14. *Lyra. in Daniel. c* 8.
(8) *De Sacra Script. fol.* 421. 424. 425.
(9) Ep. to the Bretheren of Engl. Scot. and Irel. &c.
(10) *Loc. com. loc.* 59. *fol.* 187.
(11) *Ibid. fol.* 177.
(12) *L.* 52. *fol.* 149.

rent Expoſitions and vnderſtandings, and yet all true, and intended by the Holy Ghoſt.

The next thing to be examined, is, which of theſe Senſes do affoard a forcible Argument for the eſtabliſhing any truth in matter of fayth and Religion. And firſt it cannot be denyed, that a firme Argument may be taken from any ſenſe, litterall or myſticall, ſo long as it appeareth that Senſe to be true and intended by the holy Ghoſt: But becauſe it is moſt difficult to know and diſcerne when theſe myſticall & ſpirituall ſenſes are true, and ſo intended by the holy Ghoſt, therefore ordinarily ſpeaking, arguments drawne from this Senſe are weake, vncertayne, and not ſufficient abſolutely to determine a Point of fayth. And ſo it is generally taught by Diuines, that, *Theologia Symbolica non eſt argumentatiua, ſymbolicall or myſticall Diuinity doth not yield a ſtrong Argument:* which truth they haue learned from S. Denis in his Epiſtle to Titus. And S. Auſtine demaundeth (13) *who but moſt impudently will endeauour to interprete by himſelfe any thing that is allegoricall, vnles he haue moſt manifeſt teſtimonies by whoſe light obſcure things may be illuſtrated.* And with him agreeth S. Hierome teaching (14) *That neuer can Parables and doubtfull vnderſtandings of riddles* (or hard queſtions) *profit to the Authority of Decrees.* And the reaſon of this is, becauſe the myſticall and ſpirituall Senſes are many; and although they may edify, when they are not agaynſt fayth or good manners, yet it doth not alwayes appeare, that they were intended by the holy Ghoſt: wherefore (15) S. Auſtine deſeruedly derideth the Donatiſtes, who from theſe words myſtically interpreted, *Shew me where thou feedeſt, where thou lyeſt in the noone day?* did gather that the Church of Chriſt did only remayne in Affrick.

(13) Ep. 48.

(14) In c. 13. Mat.

(15) Ep. 48. ad Vincent.

Seeing then a good Argument cannot ordinarily be framed from the myſticall or ſpirituall Senſe; Let vs now ſee what authority beareth the Litterall: In which, it is our generall doctrine, that ſeeing it is certayne, that Senſe which is immediatly gathered from the wordes to be Senſe of the holy Ghoſt, that therfore from the literal ſenſe are we to take Arguments that willbe efficacious: And ſo accordingly

Chem-

Chemnitius concludeth, from ſeuerall ſayings of *S. Irenæus* (16) that (17) *That is the ſound ſenſe, and which is without danger, which plainely and without ambiguity is ſet downe in the Scripture in the ſame words.* That then which is neceſſary to be knowne, is, how infallibly to find out the true Literall Senſe frō whēce Arguments of force may be taken, & truly to diſcerne when and wherein it differeth from the figuratiue.

(16) *L. 2. c. 47.*

(17) *Exam. part. 2 fol. 74, 48.*

SECT. VIII.

Certaine Rules preſcribed for the diſcerning of the ſimple Literall Senſe from the figuratiue. And for the finding out of the true ſenſe intended by the Holy Ghoſt.

WE find by dayly experience that often doubtes do ariſe cōcerning the very literall ſenſe of Scripture: And this ſometimes through the ambiguity of words, as where it is ſaid, *Drinke ye all of this*; heere ſome think it vncertaine whether the word, *All*, ſignifieth all men without exception, or only all the faithfull, or only all the Apoſtles. Sometimes the doubtes ariſe through the propriety of words: for ſeeing the literall ſenſe (as hath bene ſaid) is ſomtimes ſimple, and ſometimes figuratiue, it is doubtfull in many places whether the true ſenſe be proper and ſimple, or figuratiue. All Catholikes vnderſtand theſe words, *This is my Body*, ſimply and plainely, according to propriety of the words: Proteſtāts expound them figuratiuely. Through this difficulty ſome haue fallen into grieuous errors, as Origen, taking (1) the words of Scripture figuratiuely, when they ſhould haue bene taken ſimply. And on the contrary, Papias, (2) Tertullian, and others, by taking the words properly, when they ſhould haue bene taken figuratiuely.

(1) *Hier. ep. ad Pamach.*

(2) *Hier. Præfat. l. 18. in Iſa. & in c. 36. Ezech. Aug. l. 20. de Ciu Dei. c. 7.*

For the auoyding therfore of theſe extremes, S. Auſtine giueth vs this good Rule, (3) *Whatſoeuer can neither be referred to the honeſty of manners, nor the truth of faith, that is to be taken figuratiuely and Metaphorically.* Againe, (4) *If any ſpeach of Scripture be commanding as forbidding ſinne, or commanding Beneficence, then it is to be taken properly: But if it ſhould ſeeme to command*

(3) *L. 3 de Doct. Chriſt. c. 10.*

(4) *Ib. c. 6.*

ſinne

ſinne, or forbid Beneficence, it is a figuratiue ſpeach.

The 2. Rule giué by S. Auſtine is,(5) that obſcure & doubtfull places may not be vrged againſt thoſe which are more plaine, but are to be vnderſtood & expounded by them. This is ſo reaſonable, that Chemnitius accepteth of it for good, ſaying;(6) *We affirme that obſcure places of Scripture are not to be expounded againſt that opinion which is expreſſed in plaine and euident places of Scripture.* And he alledgeth S. Hierome to teach, that (7) *doctrine may not be gathered out of obſcure, doubtfull, anigmaticall, and allegoricall places of Scriptures.* In regard whereof, that figuratiue ſayings afford no certaine proofe or Argument in matters of faith, it is taught by moſt Proteſtants, as (8) Chemnitius, Aretius, M. Willet, Oecolampadius, Lubbertus, and M. Downham, who affirmeth it to be *a Rule in Diuinity, that, Theologia Symbolica non eſt argumentatiua.*

A third Rule is, that the wordes of Scripture are euer to be taken in their playne, proper, and litterall ſenſe, and not to be changed into figures, vnles that Senſe be contrary to other plainer places of Scripture, or make againſt ſome knowne Article of fayth, or be oppoſite to the common Explication of the whole Church, or inferre ſome abſurdity. This is alſo acknowledged by Proteſtãts: for D. Bilſon affirmeth it to (9) *Be rightly ſayd, that, in the Scriptures ſo long as the letter may poſsibly be true, and not againſt fayth and good manners, we may not fly to figures.* Chemnitius thinketh that,(10) *when the Holy Ghoſt would haue any ſentence in the Scriptures to be vnderſtood otherwiſe then as the wordes do ſimply and properly ſignify, he plainly expreſſeth and sheweth ſo much, either in the ſame or ſome other place.* M. Hooker(11) *holdeth it for a moſt infallible Rule in Expoſition of Scripture, that where a Litterall conſtruction will ſtand, the furtheſt from the Letter is commonly the worſt.* And the very ſame is taught by(12) D. Couell. And this with great reaſon, for if thoſe textes of Scripture which being literally taken, are not directly againſt any other playner Scripture or Article of faith, may be peruerted and turned into Tropes and figures, then as Melanchon well obſerueth,(13) *All things may be peruerted:* Yea faith it ſelfe will periſh, and all diuine Myſteries depend only vpon opinion, and ſo the way laid open

(5) *De vnit. Eccl. c.16. & cont. lit Pet. c.5. & c.16.*
(6) *Exam. part.1.fol. 48.74. et. part.3.fol. 40.*
(7) *Exam. part.3 fol. 117.*
(8) *Chem. Ex. part.3. pag. 117. Aret. loc com loc. 51.p 161. & loc.81. p.161. Wil in Syn. p.17. Oecol.l. ep. Oecol. & Swingl.l.1 p. 213. Lub.de Princip. p. 400. Down. of Antich. p. 189.*
(9) In his true Diff:r, *fol.568.*
(10) *Exa. part.2 fol.71.*
(11) *Eccl. Pol l.5.Ser. 50.p. 130.*
(12) Againſt the Plea of the Innocent. *p.194. &c.*
(13) *L. Ep. Oecol. & Swingl. ep.ad Prider. Vicon p. 645.*

open to infinite errours.

A fourth Rule approued by Catholikes & Proteſtants is this: that, when the Scripture doth ſpecially inſtruct vs in the Doctrine of the Holy Sacraments, in the inſtitution or publiſhing of Gods peculiar Commandements, or in any principall Article of faith, then that ſenſe is to be holden good, for proofe of which the words are moſt plaine and literall. But for the right vnderſtanding of this, it is to be obſerued, that although our Sauiour in his ordinary Exhortation or preaching to the people, which did imply a Cõmandement, did ſometimes to ſtirre them vp to greater attẽtion, remember them in figuratiue words of ſome generall duty or Commandment, not then firſt preſcribed, but formerly knowne and commanded; yet the firſt promulgation of euery peculiar Commandement is euer deliuered in words plaine, not figuratiue or obſcure. And as touching doctrines, it is not meant hereby, that euery ſentence or opinion concerning God is euer to be vnderſtood according to the literall words, but onely that ſuch as comprehend in them a ſpeciall difficulty or neceſſity for vs to beleiue, or practiſe; ſuch as are the Articles of our faith, which are ſet downe and deliuered in plaine words, and ſo to be vnderſtood. Wherefore ſuch examples of God being a *Conſuming fire*, of Chriſt being a *ſtone*, *a lyon*, *a vyne*, *a doore*, and the like, are of another nature, not importing any principle or Article of faith or doctrine.

Againe, in the ſecluding of Tropes and figures, it is not intended that euery figuratiue locution ſhould be ſecluded, but onely ſuch as is obſcure and darke, for there be ſome which are in themſelues no leſſe eaſie and manifeſt then the other: As for example to ſay, *The Cup is ſhed*, Euery one knoweth (as Beza (14) cõfeſſeth) that thereby is meãt not the Cup it ſelfe, but the thing contayned in the Cup. And this, and ſuch like are ſometimes vſuall, but yet their ſenſe is knowne and manifeſt.

(14) *In Mat.* 26. 28.

This Rule thus vnderſtood, is acknowledged by Proteſtants to be good: ſo Vrſinus preſcribeth that, (15) *Articles of faith ought to be vnderſtood properly, vnles ſome Article ſo taken properly,*

(15) *Comment. Catech. fol.* 410.

ly, do disagree with other places of Scripture. Whitaker teacheth that, (16) *Although in the words* (of Scriptures) *many things be obscure, and in many places, yet all Articles of faith are manifest.* Chẽnitius affirmeth that, (17) *The Scripture when it deliuereth doctrine or Commandements, to be certaine, & nothing obscure.* Melancthon discoursing of this matter cõfesseth that, (18) *Although the phrase of Scripture be full of figures in narratiõ of things done, yet* saith he, *If in the Commandements or Doctrines which containe the nature or will of God, we goe about to doe the like, what shall follow, learned men may easily iudge.* Whereupon he concludeth that in Doctrines of faith, the Scriptures ought to be taken properly, as the words do vsually signifie, vnles therby, *An absurdity doe light vpon other plainer places of Scripture:* Which if it doe, then, saith he, *It is to be redressed by the benefite of figures: But if the Absurdity light only vpon reason, and not vpon the Scripture*, then, as he teacheth, *must the word of God be preferred before the Iudgment of reason.* And he further auoucheth that *It is needfull that the meaning of those places be certaine, from whence Doctrine, or Articles* (of faith) *be taken*: otherwise saith he, *when the rite of Circumcision was instituted, it had bene lawfull for Abraham to haue imagined some other thing then that which the words signifie*: And, *a subtile man might haue disputed, a thing* (seeming) *so ridiculous, to be in no sort commanded of God: But* (thereby only) *to be signified, that lusts were to be restrained and bridled.* Thus fully Philip Melancthon. Lastly Carion thinketh it needfull, (19) *that in the Articles of faith, in themorall law, and in the Promise of Grace, that we be restrayned with the natiue signification of the words.*

(16) *De Secra Script. fol.* 191. 195.
(17) *Ex. part.* 1. *fol.* 48.
(18) *L. de veris. Corp. & sang Domini*, and see *L. Epist. Oecol. & Swingl. fol.* 111. 140. And Confess. Aug. tract. de Euchar.
(19) *Chron. p.* 317.

And as this Rule standeth good for the vnderstanding of such Scriptures as instruct vs in the Institution of Sacramentes and Commandementes, and in the necessary Articles of fayth: So also may it serue for the fynding out of the true sense of any other Text, in which the vsuall and Literal sense is euer true; if so the said sense make not against some other plainer places of Scripture, or be contrary to some Article of fayth, or opposite to the general vnderstanding of the Church, or therwith it inferre some grosse and plaine absurdity. These Rules prescribed and approued both by Catholickes and Prot. if they likewise be obserued in the Expo-

Expoſition of the Scriptures, they wil certainly diſcouer the literal ſenſe from the figuratiue, and therby preuent Prot. of their frequent flying to figures, when they are conuinced by the Letter.

SECT. IX.

An Examination of ſuch Rules as Prot. ordinarily preſcribe, and obſerue for fynding out of the true Senſe of the ſacred Scriptures.

THe firſt Rule that I fynd to be vſed and taught by Moderne Sectaries, for the fynding out of the true Senſe & meaning of the Scriptures, is the Scripture it ſelfe. (1) *The Interpretation wherof (ſay they) is to be taken only from herſelfe, that herſelfe may be the Interpreter of herſelfe &c.* And, (2) *We acknowledge that Interpretation of Scriptures for authentical and proper, which being taken from the Scriptures themſelues &c. accordeth with the Rule of faith & Charity. Yea* (3) *the true meaning of the Scripture is to be ſought in the Scripture it ſelfe, and among thoſe, that being rayſed vp by the Spirit of God, expound Scripture by Scripture.*

(1) *Harm. of Conf p.3.*
(2) *Ib.p.3.*
(3) *Ib.p.14.*

This Rule to be moſt imperfect and falſe, I proue at large (4) heerafter; for the preſent, M. Hooker ſhall confute it, auouching that, (5) *The Scripture could not teach vs the things that are of God, vnles we did credit mẽ, who haue taught vs, that the words of Scripture doe ſignifie theſe things.* And ſeeing, as D. Whitakers cõfeſſeth (6) *the Scripture hath no liuely voyce which we may heare,* but is a thing without all life: It is impoſſible to imagine that her ſelfe alone can make knowne to her Readers, the true vnderſtanding of ſo many and ſo difficult paſſages as are contayned in her.

(4) See hereafter.
(5) *Eccl. Pol. l.2.pa.116.*
(6) *De ſacra Script. pag.* 521.

Others perceyuing the inſufficiency of this, doe giue for their Rule, not the Scripture it ſelfe ſole, and alone, but as (7) it is diligently read, conferred one place with another, the Circumſtances weighed, and much prayer vſed. But theſe ſtudies and Conferences are but humane endeauours, and ſuch wherein euery man, without extraordinary Priuiledge from God, is ſubiect to error, ouerſight, and mans infirmity,

(7) *Whitak. de Eccleſ. Contr.2 q.4. p.221. & de ſcript. pag.* 521.

firmity, all his prayer and poſſible diligence notwithſtanding: and therefore cannot make and infallible Rule, as shalbe further ſundry waies euicted, in this (8) Treatiſe following. Onely I will now obſerue what D. Whitakers, who preſcrybed the foreſaid Rule, as the beſt meanes of Interpretation, thinketh of it himſelfe. (9) *Such as the meanes are* (ſaith he) *ſuch of neceſsitie muſt be the Interpretation: but the meanes of interpreting darke places, are vncertaine, doubtfull, and ambiguous, therefore it cannot be but that the Interpretation alſo muſt be vncertaine, but if vncertaine, then it may be falſe &c.* So confeſſedly falſe is the foreſaid Rule.

(8) See hereafter.

(9) De Eccl. Controu. 2. q. 4 p. 221.

The laſt Rule then, which indeed they chiefly rely vpon, is the interpretation made by the *Holy Ghoſt*, and giuen as they imagine, to euery Priuate man. So D. Whitaker aſſirmeth euen of ſuch as are *ignorant in tongues*, that, (10) *They acknowledge and allow the Doctrine, being inſtructed by the Holy Ghoſt.* But Lubbertus ſaith more plainely that, (11) *God hath giuen to euery faithfull perſon, not only the Spirit of vnderſtanding, but alſo of diſcerning falſe Doctrine from true.* Yea ſay Brentius & D. Whyte, (12) *As the priuate man hath priuate Authority of Iudging and decyding Doctrine of Religion, ſo the Prince hath Publike.* But though it be moſt true, that the Scriptures are to be vnderſtood by the ſame ſpirit by which they were written, and giuen vnto vs, to wit, the Holy Ghoſt, and that by the Holy Ghoſt the Guift of interpretation is ſometimes giuen to particular men: yet that neither the ſaid guift is giuen to euery one of the faithfull, nor they to whom it is giuē, without ſpeciall Reuelation, can infallibly be aſſured thereof; & much leſſe can it giue any aſſurance to others of the right expounding of Scripture or decyding any Controuerſie, as I shal at large declare herafter (13). In the meane time, it is not vnworthy of obſeruation, that Proteſtants appointing theſe Rules for the finding out of the true ſenſe of Scripture, doe thereby intend no other, but to make themſelues, euen euery Priuate man, to be abſolute Iudge and Interpreter of the ſenſe of the Scripture: and ſo to exempt themſelues from all other Interpretations, though made by Auncient Fathers, Generall Councels, and the vniuerſall Church.

(10) De ſacra Script. p. 127.

(11) De Principijs &c. p. 573.

(12) Brent. Prolog. Cont. Petr. Sot. Whit. in the way to the Church. pa. 6. 27.

(13) See hereafter.

SECT.

SECT. X.

That the certaine and Infallible Rule, for the fynding out of the true Senſe of the Scriptures, is the Church of Chriſt.

ALthough Prot. ordinarily profeſſe that they (14) *Do not acknowledge that, which they call the meaning of the Church of Rome, for the true and natural Interpretation of the Scriptures*: Yet the Church of Chriſt in General Councel hath Decreed that, (15) *No man dare to Interprete the ſacred Scripture contrary to that Senſe, which the Holy Mother the Church hath anddoth hold, to whom it belongeth to Iudge of the true Senſe and Interpretation of holy Scriptures*. And this with greateſt reaſon, for if the Church hath power from Chriſt to diſcerne the word of God from the wordes of men as ſhalbe cleerly proued (16) hereafter, doubtles ſhe hath the like power of diſcerning in the words the ſenſe and meaning of God, from the ſenſe and vnderſtanding of men, both theſe being committed to the Church, that the may faithfully preſerue them, and giue them to others, to wit, the true Scriptures and true vnderſtanding therof. This God promiſed to his Church by the Prophet Eſay in theſe wordes, (17) *My ſpirit that is in thee, and my words that I haue put in thy mouth, ſhall not depart out of thy mouth, and out of the mouth of thy ſeed, and out of the mouth of thy ſeeds ſeed, ſayth our Lord, from this preſent and for euer*. Which is alſo confirmed by Chriſt our Sauiour promiſing (18) *The ſpirit of truth, which ſhould abyde for euer, and ſhould* (19) *teach all truth* And indeed ſeeing the true Ghoſpel of God, doth not conſiſt in the writings or words, but in the ſenſe; if the Church had only the written word, and not the true ſenſe therof, ſhe had not the true Ghoſpel of God, and ſo neither faith in Chriſt which is had by the true Ghoſpel; Fayth hauing relation not to the words but to the ſenſe. Wherefore Hæretickes and Deuils though they can alledge Scriptures, yet not hauing the true ſenſe, they haue not a true, but a falſe & Diabolical Ghoſpel.

(14) Harm. of Confeſſ. p. 3.

(15) Conc. Trid. Seſſ. 4.

(16) See hereafter,

(17) Iſa. 59. 21.

(18) Io. 14. 16.

(19) Io. 16. 13.

Beſydes *Chriſt opened* (20) (the Apoſtles) *vnderſtanding, that they might vnderſtand the Scriptures*, which certainly he did not for them alone, but much more for his Church: and ſo accordingly the Apoſtles deliuered to the Church the true ſenſe of them: for if they had deliuered the wordes and not the ſenſe, they had not preached the Ghoſpel, nor taught all Nations to keep all things that were cõmanded to them by Chriſt. What preaching or doctrine would that be, which were deliuered without the meaning? certainly no other then of Children, or Parrots who can giue the ſound of wordes without the ſenſe.

(20) *Luc.* 24. 45.

Laſtly, ſeeing the Church is *the Pillar and ground of truth*; and truth properly and truly is in the vnderſtanding of the Scriptures, not in the writings or words, but improperly & as in a ſigne; it euidently followeth, that she hath a certaine knowledge of the truths which are contayned in the Scriptures.

This truth is ſo certaine, that S. Auſtine for the true vnderſtanding of the Scriptures, directeth all men to the Church, ſaying, (21) *The truth of Scriptures is holden by vs, when we doe that which now hath pleaſed the vniuerſall Church, which the authority of the ſame Scriptures doth commend, that ſeeing the holy Scripture cannot deceyue, whoſoeuer feareth to be deceiued by the obſcurity of this queſtion, let him take Coũſaile therof from the Church, which without any ambiguity the holy Scripture doth demõſtrate.* But to omit ſundry other Fathers very cleare for this purpoſe, many of the learnedſt Proteſtants teach the ſame Doctrine, as I ſhall (22) ſhew hereafter: onely for the preſent, heare what D. Whitaker ſaith to Dureus his Catholike Aduerſary, (23) *Thou doſt affirme that to be the ſenſe of the word, which the Catholike Church hath receiued frõ the Holy Ghoſt; I confeſſe ſo much, for the Church is taught the true ſenſe of Scripture from the Holy Ghoſt: she is the keeper of faith, the ground and Pillar of truth.* So confeſſed and cleare it is that the true and vndoubted ſenſe and Interpretation of Scriptures, is to be learned from the Catholike Church. Wherefore all Catholiks in their Diſputes, Sermons, and Comments vpon the Scripture, doe euer place this as a ſure ground and vndeniable Principle, that the true and

(21) *Lr. Cont. Creſcon. l. 3.*

(22) See hereafter.

(23) *Cont. Dur. l. 2. fol. 134.*

and ſincere ſenſe of the Scriptures, is to be taken from the Interpretation of the Catholike Church.

SECT. XI.

An explication of what we meane by the Church, when we ſay, that the true vnderſtanding of the Scripture, and the finall Deciſion of all Controuerſies in Religion, is to be taken from the Church.

FIrſt then (1) Catholikes do heere vnderſtand by the Church, the ſupreme Paſtour thereof with a Councell of other Biſhops, Paſtours and Doctours. In ſo much that whatſoeuer by theſe in matters of fayth and manners is decreed, and propoſed to the whole Church to be belieued, that we all firmly belieue to be moſt true and infallible, & wholy agreeing with the true ſenſe of Gods word intended by the Holy Ghoſt.

Secondly, we (2) vnderſtand by the Doctrine of the Church, ſuch Points of Faith alſo, as not being written in the Scriptures, haue bene deliuered by the Apoſtles by word of mouth, the Holy Ghoſt inſpiring them, or Chriſt being the Author of them: And theſe we belieue to haue as infallible authority of truth, as if they had bene written in the Scriptures.

Thirdly (3) we likewiſe teach, that the vniuerſall & Generall practiſe of the Catholike Church, is a ſure and Infallible Interpreter of the Scriptures. In ſo much that if any Queſtion ſhall ariſe concerning any difficult place of Scripture, the general obſeruation and Practiſe of the Church concerning the matter treated in that place is to be inquired, and to be held and followed, as the beſt Interpretation, and a truth Infallible.

Fourthly, Proteſtants (4) themſelues confeſſe, that the Church during the firſt 600. yeares after Chriſt, was pure, ſincere, and truly Catholicke; to the holy Fathers then of thoſe times we appeale, firmly belieuing (5) that what they with vnanimous cõſent did teach, or the greateſt part of thẽ, without

(1) *Canus loc.com. l.11. c.6.et.l.5.c. 4. Bellar de Concil.l 2.c. 2. Et de verb. Dei.l.3. c.3. Rhem. Teſt.in Mat.18.*

(2) *Val. T.3. Diſp. 1.q.1. Punct.7.§. 44. Bellar. de verb. Dei l.4. c.3. & c. Canus loc. com. l.11.ca. 6.*

(3) *Staplet. de Princip. l.11. c.4.*

(4) Iewel in his Sermon at Paules Croſſe. Fulk in his Anſwere to a Counterfaite Catho. *p.27.33.38. Whitak. cont. Camp. Rat.*

(5) *Staplet. de Princip l.7. c.12.*

without contradiction of others, cõcerning pointes of faith, or what vnanimous Interpretation of Scripture they made concerning Articles of faith, that the ſame is by vs receiued and beleiued, as the true meaning of the holy Ghoſt, and matter of faith.

Laſtly, the Church of Chriſt hath florished and ſhyned in all Ages, with true and vndoubted Miracles, which being Truth, cannot giue Teſtimony to a falſhood; theſe alſo are ſure and infallible proofes of all ſuch Doctrine, in Confirmation whereof they are done.

Theſe are the Principles and firme grounds vpon which the Catholike Church doth build her faith and Religion: which I doe not heare goe about to confirme, with many ſuch Arguments as might be eaſily produced in proofe of them, becauſe the ſame wilbe done at large vpon ſeuerall occaſions in this Treatiſe following, to which therefore in this reſpect I referre the Reader.

THE

THE TRVE STATE OF THE QVESTION IN CONTROVERSY,

Betweene Catholikes and Proteſtants, concerning the Iudge of Controuerſies in matters of Religion, conſiſteth in this:

Whether, beſides the ſacred Scriptures, any other infallible Authority and Iudge is to be acknowledged, by which the Doctrine of Fayth, and the true ſenſe of Scriptures may be propoſed to the faythfull, as reuealed by God, and to be beleiued.

And whether the ſayd Authority and power of Iudging, be to be aſcribed to the Church, to Generall Councells, and to the Fathers of the Primitiue Church? Or onely to the ſacred Scriptures themſelues, or the Priuate Spirit of euery particular Man?

CHAP. I. SECT. 1.

Catholike Doctrine.

THIS Controuerſy being the greateſt, and that wherupon al others do depend, for the full & cleereſt Deciſion thereof, the Councell of *Trent* (1) decreeth for the repreſſing of proud wits, *that no mā relying vpon his owne wiſdome in matters of Fayth & manners &c. wreſting the ſacred Scriptures to his*

(1) *Concil. Trid. Seſ. 4. decret. de Edit. & vſu ſacrorum librorū.*

his owne ſenſe, preſume to interprete the holy Scriptures contrary to that ſenſe which our holy Mother the Church hath, and doth hould; to whome it belongeth to Iudge of the true ſenſe and interpretation of Holy Scriptures.

(2) *Decret.* 4. Before this it was taught in the Coūcell of Sens, that (2) *Contentions being riſen concerning Fayth, the Scripture often is in vaine conſulted, vnles the certaine and infallible Authority of the Church doe end the ſtrife, which diſcerneth the Canonicall Booke from the Apocryphall, the Catholike ſenſe from the hereticall, the true from the adulterate.* Theſe Councels auouch the Church to be Iudge of the true ſenſe of the Scriptures. Concerning the authority of Councels, in the ſaid Councell of Sens, it was ordayned, that, (3) *It might ſeeme abſurd, if God with ſo great care was preſent to the old Synagogue, that if anything occurred in the Law, difficult or doubtfull, which could not be ended without Controuerſie by the Iudges and Lawiers, yet they ſhould not want a deſigned aſſembly, by whoſe ſentence all the matter ſhould be ended; yet he ſhould leaue his Church, much to be preferred before the Synagogue, without neceſſary helpes, that ſhe ſhould not haue wherupon ſafely to rely, when Queſtion of Faith aryſeth. Wherefore ſeeing the Rule of the Church is certaine and infallible &c. that authority cannot be denyed to Generall Councels, which moſt neerely doe repreſent the vniuerſall Church.* In the eight Generall Councell it was thus decreed, (4) *We profeſſe to obſerue & keepe the Decrees of the Catholike and Apoſtolike Church, receiued by Tradition, both from the Holy Apoſtles &c. as alſo from Orthodoxall, Generall, & Prouinciall Councels.* So vndoubted are the Decrees of Councels in matters of faith. The authority of auncient Fathers in expounding the Scriptures, is ſuch, as that in the Councell of Trent it is decreed, that (5) *no man preſume to interprete the ſacred Scriptures &c. againſt the vnanimous conſent of Fathers.* And it was enacted by the Councell in Trullo, that, (6) *If any Controuerſie concerning Scripture ſhalbe rayſed, let them not otherwiſe interpret it, then as the Lights and Doctours of the Church haue expoūded in their writings.* In the eight Generall Councell it was determined, that, (7) *If any man according to the cuſtome of wicked heretiks, by any meanes, either by word, tyme, or place, ſhall attempt to remoue the bounds, which the holy Fathers of the Church, or the*

(1) Con il. Sen nenſe Decret. 3.

(4) Actione 10. cap. 1. to. 3.

(5) Conc. Trid. Seſſ. 4. Decret. de Edit. & Vſu Sacrorum librorum.

(6) Synod. 6. Conſtantinop. 8. in Trullo can. 19.

(7) Synod. Conſtantinop. 8. generalis Act. 8.

the 7. Sacred and Generall Councels haue placed; or dorably inuent nouelties, and other expoſitions of faith &c. let him be condemned for euer. In the firſt Lateran Councell it is thus decreed, *We* (8) *follow in all things the Fathers and Doctours of the Church, Athanaſius, Hilarius, Baſill, Gregory &c. and we receaue all things which are expounded by them, for the right Faith, and in condemnation of Heretiks. And we receyue alſo other holy and orthodoxall Fathers who haue euer preached in Gods holy Church, the true Faith without blame.* The Biſhops & Doctours in the Councell of Valence ſaid, (9) *We doe reuerently ſubmit our hearing, and vnderſtanding &c. to the cleareſt expoſitors of ſacred Scripture, that is, to Cyprian, Hilary, Ambroſe, Hierome, Auguſtine, and the reſt &c. And to our power we imbrace what they haue written for our ſaluation.* So that by the ſeuerall Decrees of ſo many Councels it appeareth, that the true ſenſe and interpretation of Scriptures, and thereby the deciding of all diffrences in Religion, are to be knowne and taken from the Catholike Church, from generall Councels, and the vnanimous conſent of auncient Fathers. This is our Catholike doctrine.

(8) Conc. Later. ſub Martino 1. Conſul. 5.

(9) Conc. Valens. ſub Leone p. 4. cap. 1.

Proteſtants vntruthes.

The Authority of the Church not being to be infringed by any true and ſolid argument, Proteſtants endeauour to weaken the ſame by falſhoods and vntruthes: for wheras (15) all Catholicks teach, *that the Scriptures are in ſundry reſpects to be preferred before Councels*; Caluin falſly accuſeth vs in theſe words: *To* (16) *ſubiect thus the Oracles of God to the Cenſure of men, that therfore they ſhould be allowed, becauſe they pleaſed men, is a Blaſphemy vnworthy to be remembred.* Againe, (17) *we do not after the manner of Papiſts ſay, that the ſacred Scriptures ought to be caſt away, that we may reſt vpon the authority of men, for this euaſion we iudge to be execrable blaſphemy.* Yt you will beliene Iohn White, (18) *All their ſpeech is of the Church, no mention of the Scriptures, or God their Father, but their Mother Church.* And, (19) *They know and confeſſe the moſt and greateſt points of their Religion, euen welnigh all wherin they diſſent from vs, haue no foundation on the Scriptures.* Luther ſpeaking of Councells, affirmeth, *there* (20) *was neuer any one pure, but either added ſome-*

(11) Bellar. de Concil. authorit. l. 2. cap. 12.

(16) Inſtit. l. 4. c. 9. §. 14.

(17) Initio libri, ſeu Inſtructionis cont. Anabap. & in Luc. c. 4. 16.

(18) Way to the Church. Ep. Dedic. n. 2.

(19) Ibid. p. 12.

(20) In Act. Apoſt. c. 25.

thing to faith, or subtracted. And he auoucheth, that the Pope (21) hath buried the sacred Scripture in durt and dust, and hath almost blotted out the whole Christian Doctrine. Maister Sparks affirmeth that (22) we preferre the authoritie of the Church the wife, before Christ the husband; that we make the written word of God inferiour in the Authority to the Church, and to haue his Canonicall credit from thence. But these and such like vntruthes fayned by Protestants, the Catholike Church disclaymeth, as meere impostures, inuented by men malignant, and barely affirmed without proofe or probability. The greatest esteem we haue of sacred Scriptures, as believing them to be Gods word, all inspired by him, all Catholike (23) Authors do fully testify, and I haue (a) formerly proued.

(21) De concil. & Eccl. propè extremo.
(22) Answere to Iohn de Albines. pag. 82. 83.
(23) Bellar de verbo Dei. l. 1. c. 2.
(a) Preparatiue. sect. 1. 2.

Protestant Doctrine.

You must euer know that the body of Protestancy, is a *Cerberus* with many heads; for in this present Controuersy, some Protestants teach, that our only Iudge vpon earth in matters of faith and Religion, are the sacred Scriptures, or written word of God: so our English Church hath decreed, that the (24) *Scripture comprehended in the Canonical bookes of the old and new Testament, is the Rule of faith so farre, that whatsoeuer is not read therin, or cannot be proued therby, is not to be accepted as any point of faith, or needfull to be followed.* This article is defended by D. (25) White. And D. Morton acknowledgeth, (26) *Protestants will haue all matters of faith squared & tried according to the written Rule, that is the sacred Scripture, euen as by the Touchstone.* (27) In the Harmony of Confessions it is determined, *that in Controuersies of Religion, or matters of faith, we cannot admit any other Iudge then God himselfe pronouncing by the holy Scriptures, what is true, what is false, what is to be followed, or what is to be auoyded.* (28) *Yea the interpretation thereof is to be taken from herselfe, that her selfe may be the Interpreter of her selfe. And so* (29) *be the sure and infallible Rule &c. whereunto all Ecclesiasticall doctrine ought to be called to account.* Other Protestants make euery faithfull man, endowed with the spirit, to be Iudge of all Controuersies in Religion. So D. Bilson styleth (30) *The people discerners and Iudges of that which is taught.*

(24) Article 6.
(25) Way to the Church. pag. 32.
(26) Apolog. part. 2. l. 1. c. 2.
(27) Pag. 4.
(28) Ibid. p. 5.
(29) English Confession. ibid pag. 10.
(30) True difference &c. part. 2. pag. 353.

Do-

Doctour Whitaker confeſſeth of ſuch as are ignorant in tongues, *that* (31) *they acknowledge and allow the Doctrine being inſtructed by the holy Ghoſt* Lubbertus auoucheth, *that* (32) *God hath giuen to euery faithfull perſon, not onely the ſpirit of vnderſtanding, but alſo of diſcerning falſe Doctrine from true*: And this in ſo full manner, that according to Brentius & Doctour White, (33) *Betweene the Prince and the priuate man is this difference; that as the priuat man hath Priuat authority of iudging and deciding Doctrine of Religion, ſo the Prince hath Publike.* Maiſter Rogers teacheth that, (34) *Authoritie is giuen to the Church, and to euery member of ſound iudgment in the ſame, to iudge in Controuerſies of faith &c. And this is not the priuat opinion of our Church, but &c. alſo the iudgment of our godly brethren in forraine nations*: ſo that euery priuate ſpirituall man is a ſupreme head of the Church, able to iudge all Controuerſies. Thus according to Proteſtats, the Iudge in matters of faith are either the ſacred Scriptures, or euery faithfull man endowed with the Spirit.

(31) *De ſacra ſcript p.* 127.
(32) *De princip. iij &c. pag.* 371.
(33) *Prolegom. cont. Petr Soto.* White in the way to the Church. *p.* 617.
(34) Def. of the Articles *Art.* 20. *pag.* 103.

Proteſtants agree with auncient Heretiks.

Proteſtants by their forſaid opinions do ſhew themſelues of what race they are come. So whereas D. Whitaker affirmeth, (35) *it is ſufficient for vs* (Proteſtants) *by comparing the Popish doctrine and Scriptures together, to know their difference and diſagreeing: we leaue it free for Hiſtoriographers* (ſaith he) *to write what they liſt.* And whereas Beza ſaith, (36) *If any ſhall oppoſe againſt my expoſition the Authoritie of certaine of the auncient Fathers, I doe appeale to the word of God.* This appealing from Fathers Hiſtoriographers and Church, onely to the written word, is condemned in Maximinus the Arian by S. Auſtine, who produceth him ſaying, (37) *If thou ſhalt bring any thing from the ſacred Scripture, which is common to all, it is needfull we heare you: But theſe words which are out of the Scripture, in no caſe are to be receiued of vs.* But not onely Arians, but (38) *all Heretiks* (ſaith S. Auguſtine) *endeauour to defend their falſe and deceiptfull opinions out of the Scriptures.* (39) *If one ſhall aske* (ſaith Vincentius) *any Heretike &c. from whence doe you proue, from whence doe you teach, that I ought to forſake the Vniuerſall and Auncient Faith of the Catholike Church? Preſently he anſwereth, For it is written: and*

(35) *Cont. Duraum l.* 7. *pa.* 478.
(36) In Burcroft. Suruey. *pag* 219.
(37) *L.* 1 *cont. Maximin. & cont. Fauſt. l.* 32. *c.* 19. *& ep.* 222.
(38) *L.* 1 *de Trinit. c.* 3.
(39) *L.* 2 *cont. Hær. c.* 35.

forthwith he prepareth a thouſand teſtimonies, a thouſand examples, a thouſand authorities, from the Law, from the Apoſtles, from the Prophets. In briefe, this appealing to onlie Scripture is condemned in the Neſtorians, as (40) Socrates teſtifieth: In the Macedonians and Eunomians by (41) S. Baſil; and in ſeuerall other heretiks by ſundry (42) auncient Fathers.

To come nearer home amongſt our neighbours, it is condemned in the Puritanes by D. Bancrofe (43). In the Anabaptiſts by Caluin (44) and Hooker (45). In the Proteſtant Arians by (46) *Simlerus*; and the ſame is the doctrine and practiſe of the Browniſts (47). And yet that all Proteſtants when they are vrged by Catholicks, do vſe the ſame ſhamfull flight to only Scripture, their owne Brethren ſhall accuſe them. The Anti-trinitarians ſay to the Tigurine Proteſtants (48). *You haue taught vs that nothing is to be receyued beſides the Scriptures; therfore we demand where it is written in the Scriptures? &c. Except you ſhew this according to your Rule, we reiect and condemne thoſe things: therfore we haue learned of you to contemne the Fathers.* In like ſort ſayth Socinus the Arian to Volanus the Proteſtant: (49) *To what purpoſe ſhould I anſwere that which thou borroweſt from the Papiſts &c. You are no leſſe deceiued in vrging againſt vs the Churches perpetuall conſent, then are the Papiſts in vrging therof both againſt you and vs &c.* (50) Euen Volanus himſelfe diſputing againſt the Ieſuits, *is inforced to reiect the examples, ſayings, and deeds of Athanaſius. Hierome, Auſtine, Theodoret, and other Fathers, whoſe authoritie he now oppoſeth againſt vs, as ſacred. Thus &c. Volanus may receiue anſwere from himſelfe, when he ſo often inforceth againſt vs the authoritie of learned men, and conſent of the Church.* Luther himſelfe auoucheth that, (51) *It is true that the ſacred Scripture is the booke of Hereticks, becauſe Hereticks are accuſtomed to prouoke to that Booke: neither did there aryſe at any tyme any Hereſy ſo peſtiferous and ſo foolish which did not endeauour to hyde it ſelfe vnder the veile of Scripture.* So cleere it is, that all ſorts of Sectaries, whether Proteſtāts or Puritanes, do agree with the ancient hereticks in reiecting the authoritie of the Fathers and of the Church, and in appealing only to the ſacred Scriptures, or the Priuat Spirit. Of which appealing by old hereticks to the Priuat Spirit, I ſhall (52) ſhew hereafter.

(40) L. 7. c. 2.
(41) *De ſpiritu ſanc. c. 15. & l. 1. cont. Eunom.*
(42) *Hilar. orat. cont. Conſtant. Tertul. l. de præſcript. c. 15. Hieron. ep. ad Paulin. & tom. 1. cont. Lucif. Ambroſ. in c. 1. ad Tit. Orig. hom. 7. in Ezech.*
(43) Suruey of pretended *diſcip. c. 27.*
(44) *Tract. Theo. pa. 57. & inſtruct. cont. Anabap. p. 478.*
(45) *Eccl. Pol. præf. pa. 38.*
(46) *De æterno Dei filio l. 1. c. 2.*
(47) In their apology, *pa. 203. 4. 98. 99. 100.* and ſee Ainſworth in his counterpoyſon, *p. 15. 154.*
(48) *Simlerus de ſil. Dei.* in

Proteſtant Errors.

It is worthy obſeruation to ſee the groſſe errors and abſurdities into which Hereſy doth plunge a man. Caluin acknowledgeth of the Proteſtant Libertines, that *they* (53) *were accuſtomed to laugh, if any man alledged the Scriptures: neither to haue diſſembled, but that they would them for fables &c. If any place was obiected vnto them, they anſwered, we are not ſubiect to the letter, but ought to follow the ſpirit that quickneth.* Swenckfeldius (54) alſo reiected the written word, as *the letter that killed*, contending himſelfe only with the internall ſpirit. Luther teacheth, *that* (55) *the right of interpreting Scripture is equally granted to the Laity, as the learned.* Yea he trembleth not to ſay, *although the Papiſts do bring a great heap of Scriptures in which good works are commanded: Yet I nothing care for all the words of Scripture, although more then thoſe were yet produced. Thou Papiſt doſt greatly contemne, and with the Scripture makeſt thy ſelfe corragious, which yet is inferiour to Chriſt as Lord. Therfore I am nothing moued therwith. Go too then, rely vpon the ſeruant as much as thou wilt, but I do rely vpon Chriſt the true Maſter, Lord, and Emperour of Scripture. To him I do aſſent, and know that he will lye to me in nothing, nor will lead me into errour. I do rather make choice to honour and beliue him then that with all the ſayings of Scripture, I will ſuffer my ſelfe to be remoued from my Opinion a nailes breadth.* And in ſundry places he auerreth, that (56) *the Apoſtles might erre and teach falſe doctrine*; And that themſelues dayly doubted of the truth of their Doctrine. See how an Enemy of the Church, becomes alſo a contemner of Scripture it ſelfe, when it ſpeaketh againſt him.

Reynolds auoucheth that (57) *S. Iohns Ghoſpell alone is ſufficient to Saluation.* But if I ſhould tell him that according to his Doctrine, all Controuerſies are to be decided by Scripture, and nothing is to be beliued but what is taught in Scripture; he would neuer be able to thow that all this is performed only by S. Iohns Ghoſpell.

Some Proteſtants affirme, that the Old and New Teſtament, or the Law and the Ghoſpell, are contrary one to another: Illyricus teacheth that (58) *there are two kinds of doctrine, the Law, and the Ghoſpell, and thoſe of themſelues, and their owne*

Bullingers *praf. therto. fol. 4 & in Simlerus* his preface. *fol. 1.*

(49) *Lib. de Chriſts nat. p. 11.*

(50) *Ibid. pa. 111.*

(51) *In poſtil. Wit. in 2. con. 8. Dom. poſt Trinit. fol. 118.*

(52) See heerafter *chap. 4.*

(53) *Inſtruc. aduerſ Libert. c. 9.*

(54) See *Staphylus l. de concord. diſcip. Lutheri.*

(55) *Tom. de Sacram. Alt. tom. 2. Ger. VVit. in Gal. 3. pag. 147.*

(56) *Colleq. Iſleb. de Chriſto fol. 96. Tom. 1. Ger. VVit. part. 2. fol. 190. Tom. 3. Ien. fol. 500. in Colleq. de ſpir. Sanct. fo. 125. de tenta-*

owne nature truly contrary. (59) This truly is the key of the whole Scripture and Diuinity, to know that therin is contayned a double kind of doctrine, and a double way of Saluation, which of themselues are plainly contrary one to another. The(60) Law and the Ghospell of themselues do fight altogether. These doctrines do fight but the inferior Law doth yield to the superior Ghospell, and so one Contradiction fayling, the other remaineth true. Caluin likewise affirmeth, that (61) Paul maketh the iustice of the Law and the Ghospell contrary amongst themselues. This errour is so wicked, that the Protestant Pareus auoucheth, (62) If the doctrine of the Law, and the doctrine of the Ghospell be contrary, God in his word should be contrary to himselfe, which God forbid. Such grosse and execrable errors doe Protestants teach and defend, against the truth and authority of holy Scriptures, though at other times when they are pressed with the authoritie of the Church, of Generall Coūcels, and auncient Fathers, they seeme wholy to appeale to them.

tion. fid. fol. 218. Tom 6. Ger. Ien fol. 86. Tom. 7. Ger. V Vit. f. 481.

(57) Conclus. annex. to his Confer. pag. 686.

(58) In Claud script. part. 2 tract. 1, Col 20.

(59) Ibid. Col. 11.

(60) Ibid. Col. 39.

(61) Instit. l. 2. c. 9. §. 4.

(62) In Gal. 3. lec. 40.

SECT. II.

The sacred Scriptures clearely teach that we are to repaire to the Church of Christ, for the finall deciding of Controuersies in Religion.

I Must once for all, most earnestly intreat the Christian Reader, of what Profession soeuer he be; that he diligently obserue, whether the Texts of Scripture alledged, being taken in their natiue signification, and according to the literall sense which the words of themselues doe import, doe not clearely make for that Catholike point of doctrine, for which they are produced: for that being graunted, I gayne the intent which is heere desired.

In the booke of Exodus we read that, Moyses said to Iethro, (1) *The people commeth to me seeking the sentence of God. And when any Controuersie chanceth amongst them, they come vnto me to Iudge between them, and to shew the Precepts of God, and his Lawes. But Iethro said &c. Heare my words and counsailes &c. Be thou to the people in those things that pertayne to God &c. And to shew to the people the Ceremonies and rytes of worshiping, and the way wherein they*

(1) C. 18. 15. 16. 19. 20. 22. 22. 23 24. 25. 26.

ought

ought to walke, and the workes that they ought to doe. And prouide out of all the People, men that are wiſe, & deeſeare God &c. which may iudge the people at all times: and what greater matter ſoeuer ſhall fall out, let them refer it to thee, and let them iudge the leſſe matters only &c. If thou doſt this, thou ſhalt fulfill the Commandmẽt of God &c. which things when Moyſes heard, he did all things that he had ſuggeſted vnto him. And chooſing ſubſtantial men &c. he appointed them Princes of the people &c. who iudged the people at all times; and whatſoeuer was of greater difficulty they referred to him, themſelues iudging the eaſier cauſes only. Now that theſe might rightly performe their charge, it is further ſaid by God to Moyſes, (2) *I will take of thy ſpirit, & will deliuer to thẽ &c.* Many wordes in this Text plainly proue, that Moyſes was the Supreme Iudge ouer the Iſraelits euẽ in matters of Religion. Let vs now examine thoſe pooreſt euaſiõs, which Proteſtãts haue for the auoyding of this plaineſt Text. M. Bridges (3) anſwereth heerunto, that the charge giuen heerto Moyſes, was only in regard of ciuill cauſes, but this is cleerly contrary to the former words of Scripture, Moiſes being to ſhew to the people, *The precepts of God & his Lawes, the things that pertayne to God, & the very Ceremonies & rytes of worſhipping.* Other Proteſtãts yet further reply, that Moyſes was not a Prieſt, but only a temporall Prince. But this is likewiſe moſt vntrue, for the ſame Scriptures affirme, that Moyſes exerciſed all functions of Prieſthood, as teaching the (4) *People all Precepts of God & his Lawes*, (5) *conſecrating Aaron, and other Prieſts, and* (6) *annointing them, and their garments*; yea which is moſt proper vnto a Prieſt; (6) *he offered ſacrifice euery day continually.* A truth ſo manifeſt, that the Prophet Dauid ſayd, (7) *Moyſes and Aaron in his Prieſts.* And whereas Hunnius auoucheth that (10) *Moyſes ſacrificed as a Prophet of the Lord, not as a Prieſt*, this is barely affirmed without all ground or prooſe, and is cleerly conuinced of falſhood, by what hath been ſayd next before.

(2) *Num.* 11. 17.

(3) Defence &c. *l.* 2. *fol.* 237.

(4) *Exod.* 18. 15

(5) *Exod.* 28. 2.

(6) *Ib. ver.* 7. 21.

(6) *Ibid. vers.* 30. 37.

(7) *Pſ.* 98. 6.

(10) *Colloq. Ratiſb. Seſſ.* 2.

As Moyſes being a Prieſt, was thus ordayned by God the ſupreme Iudge euen in cauſes Eccleſiaſticall: ſo were the people of Iſrael commanded to go to the high Prieſt for the finall decyding of their doubtes and diſſentions. (11) *If thou perceyue* (ſayth Moyſes) *that the iudgement with thee be hard and*

(11) *Deutr.* 17. 8. 9. 10. 11. And ſee *cap.* 21. 5.

doubtfull betweene blood and blood, cauſe and cauſe &c and thou ſee that the words of the Iudges within thy gates do vary; aryſe and go vp to the place which our Lord thy God ſhall chooſe. And thou ſhalt come to the Prieſts of the Leuiticall Stock, and to the Iudge that ſhall be at that time; & thou ſhalt aske of them, who ſhall ſhew thee the truth of the Iudgment. And thou ſhalt do whatſoeuer they that are Preſidents of the place, which our Lord ſhall chooſe, ſhall ſay and teach thee, according to his Law, and thou ſhalt follow their ſentence: neither ſhalt thou decline to the right hand, nor to the left hand. But he that ſhalbe proud, refuſing to obey the Commandement of the Prieſt, which at that tyme miniſtreth to our Lord thy God, and the decree of the Iudge, that man ſhall dye. Here the people are commanded vnder paine of death, to ſubmit themſelues and their cauſes to the deciſion of the high Prieſt. But D. Whitaker heere (12) replieth, that the people were but commanded to obey the Prieſt, if he taught them *according to the Law*; in which ſenſe Proteſtants profeſſe to obey the Church or Councels, if they decree according to the Scriptures: Yet this doth nothing auayle; for firſt D. Whitaker and other Proteſtants, appealing euer to the Originall, as to the fountaine, and text moſt authenticall, and reiecting our vulgar tranſlation as corrupt, theſe words, *And teach thee according to his Law*, are only to be found in our vulgar, and not in the Hebrew. Secondly the forſaid words are not conditionall, but words of promiſe or aſſurance, that he ſhall teach the truth according to the Law, which appeareth as well, in that the people are commanded vnder payne of death, to abyde the Prieſts abſolute ſentence, as alſo in that, if the people were to iudge whether the Prieſt gaue ſentence according to the Law, or no, then not the Prieſt, but the People were Iudges: And ſo wheras this Law was made for the Satisfaction of the People in their doubts, and finall ending of their controuerſies, all things would be left no leſſe doubtfull and diſagreeing then before.

(12) *De ſacra Script. controu. 1. q. 5. p. 463.*

Wherfore (13) Brentius further replieth, that the people are here referred not only to the Prieſt; but alſo to the ciuil Iudge, who therfore may heare and determine cauſes Eccleſiaſticall. But the anſwere is eaſy, for firſt by the word, *Iudge*, we

(13) *In Prolegom. cont. Petrum à Soto.*

we may wel vnderſtand the chiefe or high Prieſt, for according to the Hebrew it is ſaid; *Aſcend to the Prieſts, and to the Iudge*, as if it had been ſaid, Aſcend to the Councel of Prieſts, and their Prince the high Prieſt. Secondly though we vnderſtand by the *Iudge* the ciuil Magiſtrate, yet this only argueth their Offices to be diſtinct, as the Prieſts Office to concerne matters Eccleſiaſticall; the Magiſtrates, matters ciuill; the Prieſts, to giue definitiue ſentence; the Magiſtrats to execute the ſame.

This anſwere then not ſatisfying, other Proteſtants ſeeke to euade by affirming barely that the forſayd Law of Deutronomy concerned only matters ciuill, not ſpirituall or directly tending to God. But beſids that the law was generall, concerning all doubts arysing from the law, and the text ſayth in generall, *betweene cauſe and cauſe*; ſeeing heer it is euident that the people are referred by God to the high Prieſt, for the determining of their difficulties; how abſurd & diſtasting would it be to our politick State, if our Engliſh Clergy ſhould affirme, that the decision of temporall and Ciuill ſuits were to be referred to the Prieſt or the Church? Yea how ſeuerely would Biſhops and Miniſters be puniſhed, if they ſhould but endeauour to aſſume any ſuch pretended authority?

Others obſeruing that none of the foreſayd euaſions do ſatisfy ſo plaine texts of Scripture, as not being able to deny the words to be moſt euident, do therefore, as acknowledging the ſame, yet further anſwere; that many things eſtabliſhed in the old Law, are now abrogated by the new, and therefore, an argument drawne from the decrees & practiſe thereof, to be now inualide, in regard of our tyme of grace. But this alſo is as inſufficient as the former anſwers; for although many things vſed in the old Law, being Ceremonial, be now abrogated; yet that maketh no more againſt the Eccleſiaſticall Iudge now, then it doth againſt the Iudge in Ciuill cauſes, or the temporall Magiſtrats, which were appointed by God, and exerciſed their authority during the old Law: and therefore moſt things then preſcribed, not being Ceremoniall, are ſtill with vs Chriſtians, though not

in euery circumstance, yet in substane obserued. And the rather ought this to be, seeing the occasions to haue Controuersies ended, and the dangers of erring are now no lesse then they were during the tyme of the old Law.

But all this is yet more fully explained and confirmed by holy King Iosaphat, who hauing appointed Priests in Hierusalem, sayd thus vnto them; (14) *Euery cause that shall come to you of your brethren &c. Whersoeuer there is question of the Law, of the Commandement, of Ceremonies, of iustifications; shew it them, that they sinne not against our Lord &c. And Amarias the Priest, and your Bishop shalbe Chiefe in these things, which pertaine to God: moreouer Zabadias &c. who is the Prince in the house of Iuda, shalbe ouer those works, which pertaine to the Kings Office.* So distinctly doth King Iosaphat allot to the Bishop the decision of questions *of the Law, of the Commandement, and of all things which pertaine to God*, leauing the care of such things as *pertaine to the Kings Office*, to Zabadias a temporall Prince.

(14) 2. Paralip. c. 19. 10. 11.

Now it will not suffice to answere, that Iosaphat made this distinction and Decree by his owne authority, & therefore that the power which the Priest had for iudgment, was but giuen him by the King, and depended of his pleasure; for we haue seene before to the contrary, that the Ordinance was by God himselfe, who gaue the same authortty to Moyses, and afterward enacted a Law thereof in Deuteronomy, chap. 17. So that Iosaphat did onely command the execution of that which God had formerly prescribed.

By the Prophet Ezechiell God saith of Priests, (15) *They shall teach my people what is between a holy thing and polluted, & between cleane and vncleane they shall shew to thē; And when there shalbe a Controuersy, they shall stand in my Iudgments, & shall iudge &c.* By the Prophet Aggeus God directeth his people *to aske* (16) *the Priests the Law.* And by Malachy he promiseth that (17) *The lips of the Priest shall keep knowledge, & the Law they shall require of his mouth, because he is the Angell of the Lord of Hosts*; that is, his messēger sent & appointed to declare the truth. These texts are cleare for the Priest being Iudge, and the peoples requiring the knowledge of the Law from him.

(15) C. 44. 23. 24.

(16) C. 2. 12.

(17) C. 2. 7.

This place of Malachy is so forcible, that Protestants for

for want of better anſwere, inſteed of, *ſhall keepe knowledge*, doe moſt corruptly (18) tranſlate, *ſhould preſerue knowledge*, contrary to all Originals.

(18) *Engl. Bibl. of* 1578.

Laſtly of the practiſe of the old Teſtament, it is ſaid, expreſſely, and this according to the Proteſtants tranſlation (19), *that* (20) *the Leuites cauſed the people to vnderſtand the Law &c. and they read in the booke of the Law of God diſtinctly, and gaue the ſenſe, and cauſed them to vnderſtand the reading &c. Then all the people &c. made great ioy, becauſe they had vnderſtood the words that they had taught them. And on the ſecond day, the chiefe Fathers of all the people, the Prieſts, and the Leuits, were gathered vnto Eſdras the Scribe, that he alſo might inſtruct them in the wordes of the Law.* So plaine it is, that the people of the old Law, were inſtructed in their vnderſtanding of the Law, and the Scriptures, not by their owne reading and conferring of Scriptures, or by any imagined and inuiſible Ghoſt, but by the *Prieſts* & *Leuits*, who were then the Paſtors of their Church. And agreably to this we ſhall ſee shortly, that the Apoſtle (21) affirmeth, that now in the Church *Chriſt hath placed not only Apoſtles, Prophets, and Euangeliſts*, but alſo next after them *Paſtors and Doctors*: The diuine Prouidence diſpoſing, that we ſhould haue not only the ſacred writings of the Apoſtles, Prophets, and Euangeliſts, but alſo the Commentaries, Interpretations, and Preachings of Paſtors and Doctors, in explanation therof. Which *Paſtors and Doctors* (as Caluin (22) gathereth vpon this place) *haue an ordinary Charge in the Church, and the Church can neuer want them, but euermore*, as he ſayth, *Doctores præſunt Scripturæ interpretationi* &c. *Doctors haue authority to interpret the Scriptures, that ſincere and wholſome doctrine may be retayned among the faithfull.* So falſe it is, that the externall Iudgment granted in the old Law, is now abrogated by the New.

(19) *Engl. Bibl. of Anno* 1578.
(20) *Eſd.* 2. 8.7.8.12.13.
(21) *Eph.* 4. 11.
(22) *Inſtit. c.* 3. *de fide.*

Now this courſe of deciding Controuerſies by the Prieſts or the Church, being ſo generally preſcribed and practiſed in the old Law, was in it ſelfe ſo good and profitable, that Chriſt at his comming approued and confirmed the ſame, ſaying, (23) *Vpon the Chayre of Moyſes haue ſitten the Scribes, and the Phariſees. All things therefore whatſoeuer they ſhall ſay to you, obſerue*

(23) *Mat.* 23. 2.3.

obſerue yee, and do yee; but according to their workes do yee not, for they ſay, and do not. Here our Sauiour commandeth the people to obſerue and do, whatſoeuer the Scribes and Phariſees ſhall ſay, or preſcribe vnto them; and that for this reaſon, becauſe *vpon the Chayre of Moyſes haue ſitten the Scribes and the Phariſees:* ſignifying thereby, the Supreme and infallible authority, which I haue proued before, was giuen to Moyſes by God, for the decyding of Eccleſiaſticall Controuerſies: as alſo that his Succeſſours in that Chayre, were to haue the ſame, though in their liues and conuerſation they proued offenſiue and ſcandalous. Where I cannot but note the ſpeciall prouidence & care of God ouer his Church, who though he ſometyme permit the Superiours and Prelates thereof, to be of ſinneſull & ſcandalous lyfe, yet he euer ſo preſerued them from teaching falſe doctrine to the people, as that he commandeth theſe ſtill to follow their teaching, though their workes be bad: which in his goodnes and wiſdome he would not do, if in like ſort he permitted them to erre in fayth and doctrine, as in lewdnes of lyfe; but rather to the contrary would giue them Counſayle, to take good heed both of their doctrine and lyfe. To conclude then, frō the ordinance and practiſe of the old Law; If the cauſe to haue Controuerſies ended be as vrgent now, as during the Old Teſtament, and the danger of errour as grieuous; then if the People were not referred to the written word, or the Priuate Spirit, for the decyding of their doubts, but euen to a viſible and knowne Iudge, to wit, the Prieſts; may Chriſtians, (24) *Whoſe Teſtament is eſtablished in better promiſes*, expect leſſe playne and certaine meanes for ending of their Controuerſies? To affirme the contrary were indeed to prefer in this behalfe, Moyſes before Ieſus-Chriſt, & the Eccleſiaſticall gouernment and policy of the old Law, before ours, which were no leſſe abſurd in it ſelfe, then otherwiſe impious. And ſo I will paſſe to the Law of Grace.

(24) *Heb. 8 6.*

(25) *Mat. 18. 15.16.17. 18.*

It is preſcribed by Chriſt himſelfe, that (25) *If thy Brother ſhall offend againſt thee, go and rebuke him betweene thee and him alone. If he ſhall heare thee, thou ſhalt gayne thy brother. And if he will not heare thee, ioyne with thee beſides, one or two &c. And*

if

if he will not heare them tell the Church. And if he will not heare the Church, let him be to thee as the Heathen and Publican. Amen I say to you, whatsoeuer you shall bynd vpon earth, shalbe bound also in heauen, and whatsoeuer you shall loose vpon earth, shalbe loosed also in heauen. Our Sauiour heere referreth the finall deciding of dissentions amongst Neighbours vnto the Church; therefore much more doth he the same in matters of Religion. If he command an Adulterer to be brought to the iudgment of the Church, much more an Heretike. And if the Church haue authoritie to loose whatsoeuer (not onely whomsoeuer) vpon earth, then no question she hath authority to loose all difficulties arysing in Religion. And if they who disobey the Churches sentence are to be accompted as *Heathens and Publicans*, that is, damnable sinners, then it followeth euidently not onely the said sentence of the Church to be finall, not admitting any further appeale either to Scriptures, or the Priuat spirit, but also that the not hearing or disobeying the Churches Iudgment, is sinfull & punishable. D. Whitaker would auoid this two waies, first by expounding it of (26) *Ecclesiasticall Censures*, not of doctrine. Secondly by affirming that *the Church is to be heard, but in those things onely, in which she heareth and obeyeth Christ.* But if she be to be heard & obeyed in her Ecclesiasticall Censures of Excommunication and the like, much more in condemnation of Heresies; if she be confessedly the supreme Iudge in correcting and punishing vs, much more in directing & preseruing vs frō error. Neither doth Christ (as Whitaker pretendeth) restraine this Precept of obeying the Church to any particular matter, but indeed enlargeth it to all, saying, (27) *Whatsoeuer you shall bind vpon earth &c. whatsoeuer you shall loose vpon earth &c.* (28) *Concerning euery thing whatsoeuer they shall aske it shalbe done them.* (29) *And he that heareth you heareth me, All* (30) *things whatsoeuer they shall say to you, obserue and doe yee.* So cleare it is, that the forsaid place is not to be vnderstood only of Cēsures. In like sort to say the Church is to be heard, but in those things only in which she heareth and obeyeth Christ, or teacheth according to the Law, or Scriptures, is most idle, for so is any Child, and the Deuill himselfe to be heard. And so insteed of

(16) *Controu. 1. q. 4. c. 2. 3.*

(17) *Mat. 18. 18.*

(18) *Ibid. v. 19.*

(19) *Luc. 10. 16.*

(1) *Mat. 23. 3.*

of ending Controuerſies, it begetteth new ones, calling the Church it ſelfe into queſtion, when it is to be heard, and when not, and thereby making the ſenſe onely to be this; Heare the truth whereſoeuer the truth is taught according to the Law, which to ſay, is not infallible, and finally to direct vs, but rather to leaue vs in our firſt and other new perplexities. This place is ſo conuincing for the authority of the Church, as that our English Proteſtants in their Bible of 1562. doe tranſlate the foreſaid words thus: *If he heare not them, tell the Congregation.* So feareſull they are of the word *Church*, and the power therto giuen. This directiõ of Chriſt, his Bleſſed Apoſtles and our firſt Chriſtians obſerued moſt diligently, for when ſome had (31) *taught that, vnles you be circumciſed according to the manner of Moyſes, you cannot be ſaued: No little ſedition therefore being riſen to Paul and Barnabas againſt them, the Church of Antioch appointed, that Paul and Barnabas ſhould go vp, and certaine others of the reſt, to the Apoſtles and Prieſts vnto Hieruſalem vpon this queſtion.* Which they accordingly doing, *the Apoſtles and Ancients aſſembled to conſider of this word. And when there was made a great diputation, Peter ryſing vp* decided the matter, whoſe ſpeach *Iames* confirmed, and the whole *Church of Hieruſalem* ſo aſſented thereunto, as that they agreed the forſaid decree to be ſent to Antioch, ſaying, *It hath ſeemed good to the Holy Ghoſt and to vs, to lay no further burthen vpon you, then theſe neceſſary things* &c. Now when this decree was *read at Antioch, they reioyced vpon the conſolation.* And *when Paul and Timothy paſſed through the cities, they deliuered vnto them to keep the Decrees that were decreed of the Apoſtles and Ancients which were at Hieruſalem*; yea it is expreſly ſaid, that *Paul walked through Syria and Cilicia, confirming the Churches: Commanding them to keep the Precepts of the Apoſtles and the Ancients.* Here the deciding of the forſaid Controuerſy, was not referred to the conference of Scripture, or the Priuat ſpirit, but to the Iudgment and determination of the Apoſtles, Prieſts, & Church of Hieruſalem: which after conſult had therof, they determined, and their Decree without al further apeale was receiued with ioy, and was holden as a Precept, and the obſeruation therof was cõmanded by S. Paul. The Scriptures

(31) *Act.* 15. 1. 2. 4. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. 13. 19. 22. 28. 29.

further

further teach vs, that we are bound to heare and obey our spirituall Pastors: Christ said vnto his Apostles, (32) *He that heareth you, heareth me, and he that despiseth you, despiseth me.* S. Paul likewise, (33) *Obey your Prelates, and be subiect to them: for they watch, as being to render account for your soules.* Now if we be commanded to heare and obey them, as our *Prelates*, (34) *Pastors, and* (35) *Doctors*, then may we safely rely vpon their Iudgment and determination: for if they could erre, and so we, in following and obeying them, then might we lay the fault vpon Christ and his Apostles, who commanded vs to obey them. And whereas some reply, that Pastours, Prelates, and Doctours, being men, and according to Scripture, (36) *Euery man is a lyar*, that therefore we cannot be infallibly acertained that their teachng is not erroneous: This doth not suffice, for though by nature they be men and subiect to lyes and deceypties, yet by Pastorall authority they are true Gouernours of the Church, and instruments of the holy Ghost, by whose assistance in their Generall assemblies, and publick decrees, they cannot erre in matters of faith. S. Paul speaking of the Ghospell which himselfe preached, and which he had from the holy Ghost, sayth, (37) *I went vp againe to Hierusalem with Barnabas &c. And I went vp according to Reuelation, and conferred with them the Ghospell, which I preach among the Gentils, but apart with them that seemed to be something, least perhaps in vaine I should runne, or had runne.* By this it is cleere, that though S. Paul was taught his Ghospell of God, and not of men, and had an Extraordinary calling by Christ himselfe; yet by *Reuelation* he was sent to Hierusalem, to confer the said Ghospell with his Elders, the Ordinary Apostles, which afterwards he nameth to (38) *be Peter, Iames, and Iohn:* not that himselfe was doubtfull of the truth of his Ghospell, but beause other men could not, nor would acknowledg so much, till he were allowed by such as were without all exceptiõ knowne to be Apostles, and to haue the spirit of truth, to discerne whether the vocation, Spirit, and Ghospell of Paul, were of God: he knowing that otherwise without conference with them, he should loose his labour, both for the tyme past, and to come.

(32) *Luc.* 10. 16.
(33) *Heb.* 13. 17.
(34) *Eph.* 4. 11.
(35) *Mat.* 28. 19. 20.
(36) *Psal.* 115. 11.
(37) *Gal.* 2. 1. 2.
(38) *Ver.* 9.

Theſe texts of Scripture do plainly direct vs to the Church and Paſtors therof, for the cleering of all doubts, and the determining of all controuerſies and queſtions, which ſhall aryſe in matters Eccleſiaſticall.

SECT. III.

That the Ancient Fathers expound the ſacred Scriptures agreably with Catholicks in proofe of the Church being the Iudge of Controuerſies.

FOr the right vnderſtanding of the true ſenſe of the foreſaid Scriptures, let vs now ſee in what manner they were expounded by the ancient Fathers and Doctors. Wheras I proued before that Moyſes was appointed by God the Supreme Iudge in matters Eccleſiaſticall; and Proteſtants anſwered therto, that Moyſes was no Prieſt, and therfore could not be a competent Iudge in thoſe cauſes: S. Auſtin expounding theſe words of the Pſalme, *Moyſes and Aaron in his Prieſts*, ſaith, (1) *Aaron was brother to Moyſes, whom he ordained Prieſt &c. But if Moyſes was not a Prieſt, what was he? Could he be greater then a Prieſt? This Pſalme expreſſeth that he was a Prieſt, Moyſes and Aaron in his Prieſts. Therfore they were prieſts of our Lord.* Yea els where he affirmeth, that (2) *This Pſalme maketh it vndoubted, that Moyſes was a Prieſt.* S. Hierome intending to proue that Samuel was not Prieſt or Biſhop, (though ſome hould that he was Extraordinary, (3) writeth thus. *In the pſalmes he is not named among Prieſts, but amongſt thoſe who inuocate the name of our Lord: Moyſes and Aaron in his Prieſts, and Samuel amongſt them who inuocate the name of our Lord.* And S. Gregory (4) Nazianzen in proofe heerof, hauing produced the ſame pſalme, calleth *Moyſes the Prince of Princes, and the Prieſt of Prieſts*: ſo cleerly do the Fathers proue from Scriptures that Moyſes was a Prieſt. Now that Moyſes was not only a Prieſt, but that his Chaire or authority was to be reuerenced and obeyed, S. Auſtine confirmeth from the words of Chriſt himſelfe; for hauing numbred in order of ſucceſſion all the Biſhops of Rome, from S. Peter to *Anaſtaſius*, who then

(1) *In Pſal. 98.*

(2) *Quæſt. 23 in Leuiticum.*

(3) *L. 1. cont. Iouin.*

(4) *Orat. ad Greg. Nyſſenum.*

then was Pope, he auoucheth, that, (5) *If any traytor in thoſe tymes had ſtolne into that Order of Biſhops &c. it would haue nothing preiudiced the Church and innocent Chriſtians: for whom our Lord prouiding, ſaid of euill Prelates: whatſoeuer they ſay, do ye, but what they do, do you not, for they ſay, and do not.* And againe, (6) *why doſt thou call the Apoſtolick Chaire, the Chaire of Peſtilence? If for the men, why? did our Lord Ieſus-Chriſt for the Phariſees any wrong to the Chaire wherin they ſate? Did he not commend that Chaire of Moyſes, and preſeruing the honour of the Chaire, reproue them? for he ſayth they ſit vpon the Chayre of Moyſes, that which they ſay, do ye.* As alſo (7) *neither for the Phariſees &c. did our Lord command the Chaire of Moyſes to be forſaken, in which Chaire verily he figured his owne. For he warned the people to do that which they ſay, and not to do that which they do, and that the holines of the Chaire be in no caſe forſaken, nor the vnity of the flock deuided, for naughty Paſtors.* So fully doth S. Auſtine confirme the authority of Moyſes and his Chaire, as alſo of the Church of Chriſt from the words of Chriſt. But S. Auſtine is ſo full herein, as that he referreth our certaine knowledge of the Scriptures themſelues, to the authority and determination of the Church, ſaying of himſelfe, (8) *I would not beleiue the Ghoſpell, vnles the authority of the Catholicke Church moued me therto.* Neither did he ſpeak this of the tyme paſt when he was a Manichee, as ſome (9) pretend, for all the words and circumſtances of the place conteſt the contrary, and accordingly are vnderſtood of the Proteſtant (10) Brachmanus. Yea Swinglius ſo much diſliketh them, as that he ſayth; (11) *Here I intreat your indifferent iudgments, that you freely ſpeake, whether this ſaying of Auſtine may not be thought more audacious then meet, or to haue been vttered imprudētly.* But here without intreaty, euery man may ſee, how imprudent and impudent Swinglius is, in this his vnworthy cenſure of S. Auſtine. Ioſephus witneſſeth that (12) *the Prieſts were appointed by Moyſes to be ouerſeers of all things, and Iudges of Controuerſies.*

(5) Ep. 165.

(6) Cont. literas Petil. l. 2. c. 32.

(7) Ibid. c. 61. And ſee Aug. ep. 166.

(8) Cont. ep. Fundamenti, c. 5.

(9) See Whitak. Duplicat. aduerſus Stapletonum. l. 2. c. 8. p. 387.

(10) Centuriæ tres Cent. 2. q. 3. p. 167.

(11) Tom 2. fol. 135.

(12) L. 2. cont. Apion.

Concerning S. Pauls conferring his Ghoſpell with S. Peter, Iames, and Iohn, Tertullian argueth thus: (13) *If he from whome S. Luke receyued his light, deſired to haue his faith and preaching authorized by his Predeceſſours, how much more reaſon*

(13) L. 4. cont. Marc. 10. c. 2.

ſon haue I to deſire the like for the Ghoſpell of S. Luke, ſeeing the ſame was ſo neceſſary for the Ghoſpell of his maiſter. S. Auſtine alſo ſayth hereof, (14) *The Apoſtle S. Paul called from heauen, if he had not found the Apoſtles with whome by conferring his Ghoſpell, he might appeare to be of the ſame Society, the Church would not beleeue him at all.* S. Hierome auoucheth that (15) *he had not had ſecurity of preaching the Ghoſpell, if it had not been approued by Peters Sentence, and the reſt that were with him.* (16) S. Chriſoſtome vpon theſe words, *Tell the Church*, vnderſtandeth by the *Church, the Prelates of the Church.* Now as the auncient Fathers haue thus expounded the former Scriptures in behalfe of the Church, being the Iudge of Controuerſies in cauſes Eccleſiaſticall; ſo was their owne practiſe anſwerable in all ſucceeding ages: for neuer did there herely aryſe in any age, but it was ſtill condemned and extinguiſhed by the ſupreme Paſtour and other Biſhops aſſembled who liued in the ſame age. Now to cenſure that for errour, which the vniuerſall Church teacheth, S. Auſtin (17) termeth *moſt inſolent madnes.* This is proued particularly throughout all ages by Cardinall Bellarmine, (18) who reciteth the hereſies, and the Popes and Councels that condemned them; ſhewing withall, that they were euer reputed hereticks who did not obey them. Agreably to which, D. Bilſon confeſſeth, that the Fathers (19) *In all ages, as well before as ſince the great Councell of Neece, haue approued and practiſed this* (of Councels) *as the ſureſt meanes to decide doubts.* By this it appeareth, that according to the Expoſition made by the ancient Fathers, the Scriptures do teach vs, that not the Scriptures alone, but the Church of Chriſt expounding the ſame, is to be acknowledged and receiued for our Guide and Iudge in matters of Faith.

(14) Tom. 6. cont. Faust. Manich. l. 28. c. 4.

(15) Ep. 89. c. 2.

(16) In Mat. 28.

(17) Ep. 118.

(18) De verbo Dei. l. 3. c. 6.

(19) Perpet. gouern. pag. 374.

SECT.

SECT. IIII.

That Proteſtants expound the Scriptures agreably with Catholikes in proofe of the Church being the Iudge of Controuerſies; and that ſundry Proteſtants do teach and defend the ſame Doctrine.

THE Text of Scripture is ſo cleare and conuincing for this our Catholike doctrine, as that ſundry of our chiefeſt Proteſtant Doctours, not only interprete the ſame accordingly, but withall do teach and defend the ſame truth. The very Puritanes acknowledge, concerning the Eccleſiaſticall Primacy in tyme of the old Law, that, (1) *The high Prieſt of the Iewes, was Typically and in a figure the ſupreme head of the whole Catholike Church; which though (ſay they) it were viſible only in the Prouince and Nation of Iewry, yet thoſe of other Nations and Countries (as appeareth by the hiſtory of the Acts, euen though they were Æthiopians) were vnder this high Prieſt and acknowledged homage vnto him. So that he was not a Prouinciall Metropolitan, but in very deed an œcumenicall and vniuerſall Biſhop of the whole world. And therfore the Pope of Rome, who alone maketh clayme vnto, and is in poſſeſſion of the like vniuerſall Supremacy, hath more warrant in the word of God to the ſame, then any Metropolitan or Dioceſan, not dependant vpon him, hath or can haue. So that by the word of God, either there muſt be no Metropolitans, or Dioceſans, or els there muſt be a Pope.*

(1) (Engliſh Puritaniſme p. 16 And ſee Hook. Eccl. pol. l. 5. pag. 235.

In like ſort teacheth M. Cartwright, (2) *The high Prieſt was the head Prieſt ouer all the whole Church, which was during his tyme to our Sauiour Chriſt.* So cleere it is that not only Moyſes, but euen during the whole tyme of the old Law, there was one ſupreme head Eccleſiaſticall, vnto whom all others were bound to obey. Now concerning the law of Deutronomy, wherby, as I haue formerly proued, the authority & Primacy of the Church was eſtabliſhed; Proteſtants in ſo euident a matter affirme, that the people were bound (3) *to obey their ſentence, that the controuerſy might haue an end.* D. Rainolds confeſſeth that, (4) *The law of Deutronomy was made to*

(2) In Whit. Def. pag. 428.

(3) Marg. notes of the Engl Bib. of Anno 1585. in Deut. 17. 11.

eſtablish a higheſt Court of Iudgment, in which all harder cauſes Eccleſiaſticall and Ciuil, should be determined. And the ſelfe ſame is taught by (5) D. Whitaker, D. Bilſon, and M. Hooker. Now that the ſentence grounded vpon this Law was definitiue and final, it is acknowledged by D. Bilſon ſaying, (6) *Their ſentence by Gods Law no man might refuſe without punishment of death.* Yea ſayth D. Whitaker, in this Caſe (7) *of defyning Eccleſiaſticall controuerſies by the Miniſter, it was not lawfull to appeale, for otherwiſe there would haue been no end of Contention.* With whom accordeth Doctour Reinolds affirming, (8) *that in this higheſt Court of Iudgment, all harder cauſes Eccleſiaſticall were to be determined without appeale further.* And the like is taught by M. Hooker, (9) who further alledging this Law of Deutronomy, and the former example of the Apoſtles out of the Acts, telleth the Puritanes, that *what ſucceſſe God may giue to any Conference or Diſputation, we cannot tell, but we are ſure that nature, Scripture, and Experience, haue all taught the world to ſeek for the ending of Contentions by ſubmitting it ſelfe vnto ſome iudiciall and definitiue ſentence, whereunto neither part that contendeth may vnder any Pretence refuſe to ſtand.* Yea it is a truth ſo certaine, that the Church of Chriſt is the Iudge of interpretation of Scripture, and of all other Controuerſies, that Martin Luther confeſſeth, that, (10) *we are not certaine of any priuate man, whether he haue the Reuelation of the Father or no, but the Church it is, of whom it is not lawfull to doubt.* And therupon he ſayth, (11) *I ſubmit my ſelfe to the Iudgment and determination of the holy Church.* And in another place, (12) *It is a dangerous and horrible thing to heare or believe, any thing which is contrary to the vnanimous teſtimony of fayth, and the doctrine of the holy and Catholicke Church, which she hath agreably kept from the beginning, for about a thouſand and fyue hundred yeares.* Were it poſſible to thinke that any man ſhould ſay thus much for the authority of the Church, and do the quite contrary if he were not a Luther. Caluin expreſly teacheth, that, (13) *as God in tymes paſt was not content only with the Law, or only with the Scripture, but added Prieſts for interpreters, from (14) whoſe lippes the people should ſeek the true ſenſe therof: So at this day he would not haue vs only to attend to reading, but he alſo ordayned maiſters, by whoſe labour we may*

(5) *De ſacra ſcrip. pa 466. Bilſon perpet. Gouern. c. 4. p. 20.* And ſee his true Diff. &c. *part. 3 p.* 36. 37.

(6) *Perpet. Gouern. p. 20.*

(7) *De ſacra ſcrip. pa. 466.*

(8) Conference, *pa. 251.*

(9) Preface before Eccl. Pol. pag 26. 27. 28.

(10) *Luther. l. de poteſtate Papæ.*

(11) *In Diſput. Lipſiaca.*

(12) *Ep. ad marchionem Brandeburg. quæ eſt tom. 2. Germ. fol.* 243.

(13) *In ?. l. 4. c. 1 ſec. 5.*

(14) *Mal. 2.* 7.

may be holpen. And in his Commentary, vpon theſe words, *It hath ſeemed good to the Holy Ghoſt, and vs*, he ſayth, (15) *by this is confuted the obſtinacy of thoſe who with full mouthes boaſting of faith, do no laſſe impiouſly, then proudly contemne the miniſtery of the Church. For as it were a Sacrilegious diuiſion, if fayth but in one Article ſhould depend of man a part; So they openly mock God, who paſſing by* (or neglecting) *his miniſters by whom he ſpeaketh, pretend to receiue him their maſter.* Now who are theſe true Miniſters, himſelfe telleth vs to his owne ſhame, ſaying, (16) *we ſee at this day how the Papiſts do take vnto themſelues the name of the Church, becauſe perpetuall ſucceſſion is pretended by them. And truly we are compelled to confeſſe, that they haue the Ordinary Miniſtery.* So Catholikly Caluin. Chemnitius teacheth, that in reſpect of (17) *many hard queſtions, God would haue to remaine in his Church* (to auoyd *all occaſion of errour*) *the guift of Interpretation, which is not common to all, no more then is the guift of healing and miracles. And this gift God would not haue to be contemned or reiected, but reuerently vſed, as an Inſtrument and help to fynd out the true and ſound ſenſe of Scripture.* According to the Confeſſion of Wittemberg, (18) *the Church hath right to Iudge of all doctrines:* (19) *She hath an aſſured promiſe of Chriſts perpetuall preſence, and is gouerned by the Holy Ghoſt.* Yea ſayth D. Whitaker, (20) *She hath the ſpirit of God, by whom being taught, ſhe heareth the voyce of her ſpouſe, and acknowledgeth his doctrine.* And in anſwere to Duræus, (21) *Thou doſt affirme that to be the ſenſe of the word, which the Catholicke Church hath receiued from the Holy Ghoſt: I confeſſe ſo much for the Church is taught the true Senſe of Scripture from the Holy Ghoſt, ſhe is the keeper of fayth, the ground and Pillar of truth.* And againe, (22) *It ſeemeth to thee as though I ſhould eſteem that for a great offence, that when any hard queſtion aryſeth, the Iudgment of the Church ſhould be required; which thing I confeſſe neuer came into my mynd, for the Iudgment of the Church is greatly to be accounted of, and is euer greatly of force to interpret the Scriptures rightly, and to determine Controuerſies.*

(15) *In comment. in Act. 13.*

(16) *Comment. in Ezechiel. 13.*

(17) *Exam. part. 1. fol. 61.*

(18) *Cap. de Eccleſ.*

(19) *Cap. de Concil.*

(20) *Controu. 1 q. 3. c. 6. p. 313.*

(21) *Cont. Duræum. l. 2. f. 134.*

(22) *Ibid. fol. 141. 143.*

D. Reynolds after his long debating this point, doth in the end acknowledge, that not only, (23) *Chriſt our Sauiour is to be our Iudge, but alſo they, which vnder him haue it committed to them, euen the Church of Chriſt.*

(23) *Conferi. p. 99.*

D. Ban-

D. Bancroft preached publikely, (24) *God hath bound himselfe vnto his Church of purpose, that men by her good direction might in matters of doubt be relieued; to whose godly determination in matters of question, her dutifull children ought to submit themselues, without any curious or willfull contradiction.* A saying so Catholicke, that a Puritan writer repeating the same (25) sayth, *If this be not to ioyne hands with the Papists, let the Reader be Iudge.* (26) Rogers defendeth, that *the Church hath authority to Iudge and determine in Controuersies of fayth.* And (27) *that to interpret the word of God is a peculiar blessing, giuen by God only to the Church, and company of the faythfull, though not to all and euery one of them.*

And whereas Generall Councels do truly represent the Church, the authority of them for the finall decyding of Controuersies, Protestants do confirme from the sacred Scriptures; in so much that Melanchons aduice is, that (28) *They assemble generall or nationall Councels &c. because it is written, Tell the Church. This was the custome of the Church from the very beginning &c. And Councells are the proper Iudgements of the Church: yea it is expedient, that there be Iudgements in the Church, for other Nations cannot but be scandalized, if they shall heare that we will not vndergoe the sentence of any Councell.* D. Whitgift, D. Rainolds, D. Bilson and others do gather from the former example of the Apostles in the Acts, *the necessity of* (29) *Councels for the deciding of Controuersies.*

In regard heerof Caluin sayth, (30) *We willingly imbrace and reuerence as sacred, for as much as concerneth decrees of fayth, those ancient Synods, as that of Neece, Constantinople, Ephesus the first, Chalcedon, and the like, which were assembled for the confuting of heresies; for they contayne nothing but pure and natiue Interpretation of Scripture, which holy Fathers applyed with spirituall wisdome, to the ouercoming of the enemies of Religion, who then appeared.* And in another place, (31) *We truly do willingly grant, that if Disputation happen concerning any opinion, that there is no remedy either better or more certaine, then if a Synod of true Bishops do assemble, where the doctrine controuerted may be discussed: for much more waight will such Definition haue to which the Pastors of Churches hauing inuocated the spirit of Christ, shall generally consent, then if any one alone at home, what he hath conceiued, shall deliuer to the people, or some few*

men

(14) Sermon preached the 8. of February. Anno 1588. pag. 42. 43.

(15) A Treatile entituled a Briefe discourse of vntruthes &c. contained in a Sermon preached by D Bancroft. p. 14.

(16) Def. of the Art. art. 20. Prop. 3. p. 103.

(17) Ib. Art. 20. p. 104.

(18) Concil. Theol. part. 2. p. 1. 2. And see l. 2. epist. 222.

(19) Whit. Def. p. 661. And see Carthwright, ib. and p. 678. Rain. Confer. p. 254. 255. Bilf. in his Perpet. Gouern. c. 16. p. 171.

(20) Inst. l. 4. c. 9. §. 8.

(21) L. 4. c. 9. §. 13.

men priuatly should make it. Syr Edwin Sandes confesseth that (32) *The Papists haue the Pope as a common Father, aduiser, and conductour, to reconcile their iarres, to decyde their differences, to draw their Religion by consent of Councells vnto vnity &c. whereas on the contrary syde, Protestants are as seuered, or rather scattered troopes, each drawing aduerse way, without any to pacify their quarrels, no Patriarch one or more, to haue a common superintendance or care of their Churches for correspondency and vnity: no ordinary way to assemble a Generall Councell of their part, the only hope remayning euer to assuage their contentions:*. Now that these Councells cannot erre, D. Bilson acknowledgeth with them the presence & assistãce (33) *of the holy Ghost*. And (43) *that they are strengthned with the promise of our Sauiour*. M. Ridley affirmeth (35) that, *Councells do indeed represent the whole Church, and being so gathered togeather in the name of Christ, they haue a promise of the guift and guyding of his Spirit into all truth.* From which ground of their freedome from errour, D. Bilson obseruing truly, that, (36) *To haue no Iudge for the ending of Ecclesiasticall contentions, were the vtter subuersiõ of all peace*, doth therupon infer (37) *Synods to be an externall iudiciall meanes to discerne errour*. And further he affirmeth, that the Fathers in (38) *all ages, aswell before as since the great Councell of Nice, haue approued and practised this, as the surest meanes to decyde doubts*. Luther was opinion that, (39) *If the world shall continue longer, it wilbe necessary by reason of the different interpetations of Scriptures, which now are, for the preseruing of vnity of fayth, that we receaue againe the Decrees of Councells, and fly vnto them*. To whome D. Couell addeth that, (40) *If Synods want, the Church neither at any time was, nor indeed can safly be without tempests*. Yea such is the force of a Generall Councell, that Sir Edwin Sands (as before) thinketh it (41) *The only hope remayning euer to assuage* (Protestants) *dissentions*. And M. Hooker auoucheth that, (42) *The will of God is to haue vs do whatsoeuer the sentence of Iudiciall and finall decision shall determine, yea though it seeme in our Priuate opinion to swarue vtterly from that which is right*. Which sentence sayth he, (43) *Is ground sufficient for any reasonable mans Conscience to build vpon, whatsoeuer his opinion were as touching the matter before in question*. And that,

(32) Relation &c. fol. 82.
(33) *Perpet. Govern. pag.* 372. 373. 374.
(34) *Ib. p.* 372.
(35) *Act. Mon. pag.* 1288.
(36) *Perpet. Govern. pag.* 372.
(37) *Ibid. p.* 370.
(38) *Ibid. p.* 374.
(39) *Lib. cont. Swing. de Veritate Corp. Christi in Euch.*
(40) Modest Examination. p. 130.
(41) Relation. f. 8. 2.
(42) Pref to Eccl. Pol. p. 28.
(43) *Ibidem.*

(44) *As for other meanes without this, they ſeeldome preuayle:* becauſe that, (45) *without this, it is almoſt impoſſible that we ſhould auoyd confuſion, or euer hope to attaine peace.* Of all which we may conclude, that ſeeing Proteſtants expounding the ſacred Scriptures, are inforced from thence to confeſſe, that Councels *do truly repreſent the Church, that they are guided by the holy Ghoſt into all truth, that the Fathers of all ages haue vſed them for the ending of Controuerſies, that without them the Church can neuer be without tempeſts*, and that, *they are the ſureſt meanes to decyde doubts*, that therfore for the ending of Eccleſiaſticall cõtentions, we are to appeale vnto them, as a moſt certayne and Supreme Iudge.

(44) *Ibid. p.16.*

(45) *ibid. p.28.*

And that our Proteſtants at home, do not rely only vpõ Scripture, but vpon an external Iudgmẽt or definitiue ſentence appointed for the ending of Controuerſies, appeareth by their anſwerable practiſe thereof, in the high Court of Parlament, Anno 1. Eliz. cap. 1. Where hauing reſerued the Iudgement of *Hereſy* to a Generall Councell, but yet with limitatiõ that the mãtter be declared *Hereſy* by the Scripture; it next afterwards determineth that to be *Hereſy* abſolutly, & without any ſuch or other limitation, whatſoeuer ſhalbe heerafter iudged to be *Hereſy* by the high Court of *Parlament* of this Realme. And ſo accordingly, the Puritanes in their treatiſe intituled, (46) *A Petition directed to her moſt excellent Maieſty &c.* do referre their matters in queſtion to the *Parlament to iudge therof.* But this flying of Proteſtants in cauſes Eccleſiaſticall to *Parlaments*, conſiſting for the greateſt part, of the Laity, ſtrongly conuinceth their deſperation to decyde their dayly and deadly aryſing diſſentions, only by the Scriptures.

(46) Pag. 3.

But now, becauſe the Councell of Trent (47) hath further decreed, that, *none preſume to interpret the ſacred Scriptures contrary to the vnanimous conſent of Fathers*; let vs ſee how farre ſundry of the learneſt Proteſtants, do agree with vs in the ſame Rule of interpretation by Fathers. D. Morton profeſſeth, that, (48) *It hath been the common and conſtant profeſſion of Proteſtants to ſtand vnto the Iudgment of Antiquity, for the continuance of the firſt foure hundred yeares and more, in all things.*

(47) *Seſſ. 4.*

(48) Proteſtants Appeale. pag. 354.

things. Yea (49) *Proteſtants in the diſquiſition of truth, do not abſolutely bound the name of Antiquity, within the compaſſe of the firſt Century of yeares, but are content to allow it a longer extent, & therfore in all doctrines which are truly Catholicke, &c. they refuſe not to be tried by the teſtimonies of the Ancient Fathers in the firſt fiue hundred yeares after Chriſt.* This doctour maketh here a faire floriſh, as though all Proteſtants did ſtand, as in all reaſon they ought, to the Iudgment of the Fathers of the Primitiue Church: but how falſe this is, euery Section through this whole Treatiſe, which treateth of the Fathers interpreting Scriptures, will cleerly demonſtrate. (50) Chemnitius conceiueth this tryall by the Primitiue Church, to be ſo good & iuſt, as that he thinketh, *that no man doubteth, but that the Primitiue Church receiued from the Apoſtles and Apoſtolick men, not only the text of Scripture, but alſo the right and natiue ſenſe therof.* Wherupon ſayth he, (51) *we are greatly confirmed in the true & ſound ſenſe of Scripture, by teſtimony of the Ancient Church.* And accordingly other Proteſtants confeſſe, that *the* (52) *Primitiue Church is the true and beſt Miſtreſſe of Poſterity, and going before leadeth vs the way.* D. Sarauia confirmeth the authority of the Primitiue Church, from her ſpeciall aſſiſtance by the holy Ghoſt, ſaying, (53) *The holy Ghoſt who gouerneth the Church is the beſt Interpreter of Scriptures, from him therfore is the true interpretation to be ſought, and ſeeing he cannot be contrary to himſelfe who ruled the Primitiue Church, and gouerned it by Biſhops, it is not agreable to truth now to caſt them of.*

(49) *Ibid. p. 512.*

(50) *Exam. part. 1. p. 74.*

(51) *Ibid. pag. 64.*

(52) Harmony of Confeſſ. p. 400.

(53) *Dediuerſis Miniſtrorum gradibus p. 8.*

D. Whitaker renewing the moſt audacious challenge made by D. Iewel, writeth thus to the glorious Martyr Campian, (54) *Attend Campian, The ſpeech of Iewel was moſt true and conſtant, when prouoking you to the Antiquity of the* (firſt) *Six hundred yeares, he offered, that if you could ſhew but any one cleere & playne ſaying, out of any one Father or Councell, he would grant you the victory: It is the offer of vs all, the ſame do we all promiſe, and we will all performe it.* And the like is proclaimed by (55) D. Field, and D. Morton. So that if we may beliue theſe great Doctours, all Proteſtants do appeale to the Councels and Fathers of the Primitiue Church for the deciding of Controuerſies, and for the fynding out of the true ſenſe and Interpreta-

(54) *Reſp. ad Rat. Camp. p. 90. 9.*

(55) Of the Church l. 5. in his Appendix therto. Part. 1. p. 33. Mort. Proteſtants Appeale p. 573. 574.

pretation of Scripture. Neither may we in reaſon thinke that this guift of interpretation of the ſacred Scriptures, ceaſed with the Paſtors of the Primitiue Church; but as Paſtors and Doctors are to continue, ſo (56) *the conſummation of the Saints &c. vntil we meet all into the vnity of fayth*, which is, according to Proteſtants, (57) *for euer, to the end that we be not Children wauering, and caryed about with euery wynd of doctrine.* And wherfore not by any humane authority, but by (58) *the holy Ghoſt are placed &c. to rule the Church of God:* that ſo likewiſe their infallible power and authority of interpeting Scripture, and declaring the true ſenſe therof, is alſo to continue in the Church. In proofe wherof, Caluin gathereth from theſe words of the Apoſtle (59) *And he gaue ſome Apoſtles, and ſome Prophets, and otherſome Euangeliſtes, and otherſome Paſtors and Doctours &c.* that, (60) *theſe Paſtours and Doctours haue an ordinary charge in the Church, & the Church can neuer want them, but euermore Doctors haue authority to interprete the Scriptures, that ſincere & wholſome doctrine may be retained among the faithfull.* D. Fulke confeſſeth that, (61) *the Church neuer wanteth the guift of vnderſtanding.* And both he, and D. Whitaker teach that, (62) *The people are not ſufficient to read the Scriptures without their Paſtors to guide them in all matters and doubts.* The tranſlatour of the Bible into Engliſh publiſhed Anno 1556. in his Epiſtle therto preſcribeth, that *euery one as he is placed in this body which is the Church, ought to enquire of the Miniſters concerning the will of the Lord, which is reuealed in his word; for they are, ſayth Hieremie, the mouth of the Lord, yea he promiſeth to be with their mouth, and that their lippes ſhall keep knowledge, and that the truth and the law ſhalbe in their mouth, for it is their Office chiefly to vnderſtand the Scriptures, and teach them.* So cleerly do Proteſtants attribute to the Paſtors and Doctors of the Church in all ages the guift of interpretation, the true vnderſtanding of Scriptures, and the Peoples duty in learning of them the will of God, and the deciſion of their doubts. And thus we ſee by the ſeuerall texts of the holy Scriptures, either taken in that literall & natiue ſenſe which the words do afford, or according to their Expoſition made by the Ancient Fathers, and Proteſtant writers, that our Iudge of Con-

(56) *Eph.* 4. 11. 12. 13. 14.
(57) Whitak. 29. Reinol. f. 76. Melanct. loc. com. de Eccleſia.
(58) *Act.* 20. 28.
(59) *Eph.* 4. 11. 12.
(60) *Inſtit. impreſſ. Genuæ.* 1550. c. de fide f. 214.
(61) Anſwere to a Counterf. Cath. art. 24. f. 81.
(62) Againſt Rhem. Teſt. f. 445. 6. Whitak. de ſacra Scrip. contro. 1. q. 4. f. 406.

Controuerſies is not only the written word, but the Church of Chriſt in all ages, Generall approued Councels, and the vnanimous conſent of Ancient Fathers.

Such obiections from Scriptures as are vſually vrged againſt the Iudicature of the Church, are either taken from ſuch texts, as giue great praiſes to the Scripture, or ſeeme to aſſure euery man of the aſſiſtance of the ſpirit, or which may be thought to detract from the Infallibility of the Church: of all which being to ſpeake in the Chapters following, I reſerue the anſweres for their more proper places.

CHAP. II.

The true State of the Queſtion concerning the Churches Infallibility, or not erring.

Whether the Vniuerſall Church of Chriſt can erre in defyning matters of fayth, and manners: or rather, that ſuch her Decrees are alwayes moſt true and infallible, and for ſuch are to be believed, and obſerued by the faythfull.

SECT. I.

Catholike Doctrine.

THE Church being thus proued to be the Iudge of all Controuerſies in Religion, it muſt needs follow that ſhe is free from errour, and therfore as a truth moſt certaine in the Councell of Baſil it was decreed, that (1) *the Catholike Church is enriched with ſo great Priuiledge by Chriſt our Sauiour, who founded it with his blood, that we firmely believe she cannot erre &c. in thoſe things which are neceſſary to Saluation. The holy Ghoſt who cannot lye, hath promiſed that he will ſtay with her to the end of the world, and that she is to be taught by the Holy Ghoſt in all truth.* And the ſame is taught by the Councell of Sens, ſaying, (2) *The vniuerſall Church cannot erre, becauſe she is gouerned with the Spirit of truth, abyding with her for euer, and with whome Chriſt abydeth vntill the end of the world.* And (3) *He that ſhall not follow* (her) *authority in fayth and manners,*

(1) *Reſponſ. Synod. de Authorit. Concil. Gener.*

(2) *Decret. General.*

(3) *Decret. 2.*

ners, as if he had denyed God &c. let him be holden worſe then an Infidell. And ſo accordingly it is now (4) generally taught, that the Catholicke Church of Chriſt cannot erre in matters of fayth and manners. (4) *Bellar. de Eccl. l. 3. cap. 14. Rhem. Teſt. in Luc. 18. 8.*

Points not defyned.

Some teach (10) that the particular Roman Church cannot erre in matters of fayth, in ſuch ſort that no true belieuers ſhould be found in the Roman Church. But others limit this, in caſe the Apoſtolicall Sea ſhould be remoued from Rome, which whether it can be tranſlated or no, is alſo diſputable. But none of theſe are defyned by the Church as matters of Fayth, or otherwiſe condemned as doctrines hereticall. (10) See Bellar. de Rom. Pont. l. 4. c. 4.

Proteſtants vntruthes.

Luther bluſheth not to ſay, that (11) *thoſe Sycophants who flatter the Pope* (meaning Catholikes) *are ſo beſotted, that they defend moſt audaciouſly this Paradoxe, The Councels haue power to make new articles of faith, and to change the old.* But this is an audacious lye made by Luther. White affirmeth that, (12) *For the Church, the Fathers, the Councels, the Pope, which is all they can pretend, are yielded by themſelues to be ſubiect to Error.* But Iohn white in lying followeth in this his Father Luther. Rogers auoucheth that, (13) *Neuer yet had there been a Councell, either Generall or Nationall, or whatſoeuer &c. either begun or ended to the glory of God, but it hath been, I ſay, not called only, but confirmed alſo by ſome Godly Emperour, King, or Queene. This in effect is granted by all reformed Churches.* And, (14) *by Councels, the Traditions and bookes of foolish men, haue been made of equall authority with the word of God; as by the Councell of Trent.* This is only lowd lying, and therfore needeth no other Anſwere. (11) *Lib. de Conciliis.* (12) Way to the Chur. Pref. to the Reader. n. 11. (13) Def. of the Articles Art. 22. p. 113. (14) Ib. Art. 11. p. 116.

Proteſtant Doctrine.

The Engliſh Proteſtant Church hath decreed that, (15) *the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their liuing and māner of Ceremonies, but alſo in matters of fayth.* (16) *Generall Councells* (15) Article 19. (16) Article 21. See Calu. Inſt. l. 4. c. 9.

cels &c. when they be gathered togeather, for as much as they be an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed with the spirit and word of God, they may erre, and sometyme haue erred, euen in things pertayning vnto God. Wherfore things ordayned by them as necessary to Salvation, haue neither strength nor authority, vnlesse it may be declared that they be taken out of holy Scripture. Whitaker affirmeth that, (17) God hath not promised this to the Church that it should not erre &c. The vniuersall Church may erre. The Church militant may erre. All the Pastors and Bishops of Churches may erre. It is (18) euident that the true Church euen in things necessary may erre for a tyme. Yea (19) it is euident that the whole Church erred concerning the vocation of the Gentiles. And the Church (20) also for a tyme may erre in some fundamentall points. The like is taught by (21) Beza and others. So that according to Protestants the vniuersall Church, the true Church, Generall Councels, all Pastors and Bishops may erre in matters of fayth, in things necessary, and in points fundamentall.

(17) Controu. 2. q. 4. c. 3. pa. 489.
(18) Ibid. pa. 490.
(19) Ibid. pag. 491.
(20) Ib. q. 5. c. 17. p. 541.
(21) De notis Ecclesiæ. Vol. 3. p. 139. Danæus Controu. 4. l. 3. c. 17. p. 733.
(22) Alph. de Castro. ver. Concilium.
(23) Aug. passim Cont. Donatistas.
(24) Serm. 45.
(25) De vera Eccles. refor. pa. 322.
(26) Contro. 3. p. 426.
(27) Controu. 4. p. 757.
(28) Beza de notis Eccles. Vol 3. p. 247. Badel, resp. ad art. abiurat. p. 173. Lub l. 3. de Eccl. c. 5.
(29) Controu. 2. q. 5. c. 17. p. 541.

Protestants agree with Ancient Hereticks.

The (22) Arians taught all Councells to be subiect to error, and particularly they reiected the Nicene Councell. The Donatists (23) condemned the whole Church of error. And so did also (24) Wicliffe. And the same as you haue seene do our moderne Protestants defend, as true heirs of such vnworthy Progenitors.

Protestant Errours.

We (25) *do not vrge without cause* (sayth Caluin) *the Church of God, for some ages to haue been so torne and broken in peeces, that it hath been destitute of true Pastours.* Danæus affirmeth that, (26) *the Church often hath no man for Pastour.* And (27) *the true Church hath often wanted Prelats.* And the same is taught by (28) other Protestants. Whitaker not fearing to charge the Apostles themselues with errours, sayth (29), *These were great errours, and yet we see these to haue been in the Apostles, euen after the holy Ghost had descended vpon them.* Brentius affirmeth that

that, (30) *S. Peter chief of the Apoſtles, and alſo Barnabas after the holy Ghoſt receaued, togeather with the Church of Hieruſalem, erred.* But if the Church can be without true Paſtours, it the Apoſtles who haue deliuered vnto vs the new Teſtament of Gods ſacred word; if S. Peter the head of the Church, be all of them ſubiect to errour, vpon what firme ground can any Chriſtian build his fayth or certainty of Religion?

(30) *In Apo. Confeſſ. c. de Concil. p. 900.*

SECT. II.

It is proued by Scriptures that the Vniuerſall Church of Chriſt, cannot erre in matters of fayth and manners.

I Muſt ſuppoſe what I haue formerly proued, (1) and which is acknowledged for true by ſundry Proteſtants which is, that by the Church in this queſtion is vnderſtood, not only the whole company of the faithfull, comprehending therin both the Clergy and the Laity, but chiefly that which doth truly repreſent the whole Church, to wit, the head therof, and the Biſhops lawfully aſſembled togeather in Generall Councell: Euen as the Parlament repreſenteth the whole Common wealth, and hath the Authority therof. And ſo S. Auſtin (2) calleth *the ſentence of a Generall Councell, the conſent of the whole Church.* Now that the Church taken in this ſenſe cannot erre, may firſt be proued by all ſuch arguments, as we (3) vſed before in proofe that the Church of Chriſt, is the lawfull and finall Iudge of Controuerſies in Religion, for it doth euidently follow therof, that ſhe is not ſubiect to error. Or els it muſt be granted, that Chriſt hath made for vs in matters of Saluation, an erroneous Iudge, which were abſurd and blaſphemous. The ſame is confirmed by ſuch places as ſpeake expreſly of the Church it ſelfe, (4) *Vpon this Rock I will build my Church, and the gates of Hell ſhall not preuayle againſt it.* (5) *If he will not heare the Church, let him be to thee as a Heathen and Publican.* Now if the Sentence or decree of the Church may be falſe and erroneous, it were moſt iniurious to bynd euery one vnder ſo great puniſhment to aſſent therunto.

(1) See before c. 1. §. 2. See 3. Reg. 8. 14. Mat. 18. 17. Fulk. 28. Rhem. Teſt. in Act 15. ſect. 5 Ridley Act. Mon. p. 1188.

(2) *L. 1. de Bap. c. 18. & l. 7. c. 53.*

(3) See before c. 1.

(4) *Mat. 16. 18.*

(5) *Mat. 18. 17.*

Thoſe textes litterally taken being moſt plaine in our behalfe, let vs ſee how Proteſtants would euade them. To this place Whitaker anſwereth: (6) *The ſonne of God hath commanded the voice of the Church to be heard, but not vnles she show the Scriptures.* Or as Herbrandus ſayth, (7) *As long as she foundeth heauenly and vncorrupt doctrine,* but ſo long a Child may be belieued. Field (8) and others do limit this to contentions between particular perſons, not to Controuerſies of Religion: but if the Church be to be heard in matters Ciuill, much more in Eccleſiaſticall.

(6) Deſcript. l. 1. c. 12. ſect. 1. pa 143.
(7) In Compen l. loc. de Eccleſia. pag. 492.
(8) Of the Church. l. 4 c 4 Hunnius in Colloq Ratiſbon. ſect 6. Molineus in Scuto. p. 84.
(9) In Compen l. loc. de Eccleſ. pag. 494.
(10) Eph. 1. 22. 23.
(11) Eph. 4. 4.

Herbrandus alſo limiteth this to the Church of Chriſts tymes, ſaying, *The* (9) *Commandement is not vniuerſall of the Church of all tymes, but Chriſt ſpeaketh of his little Church, according to the Condition of thoſe tymes, which then wanted a pious politick Magiſtrat, and who should be a member of the Church.* But this derogateth from Chriſts perpetual Prouidence ouer his Church: neither are thoſe tymes leſſe needfull of an Infallible teacher and Iudge, then the former. Chriſt alſo is called (10) *The head of the Church, and the Church his body;* &(11) *one body, one ſpirit;* Therfore if the Church ſhould erre, the error therof would be aſcribed to Chriſt, he being the *head* therof, and to the holy Ghoſt, as the *Soule* or lyfe. And wheras Caluin anſwereth, that Chriſt and the holy Ghoſt do teach the Church all truth abſolutely neceſſary, (which is contrary to his former brethren) but yet do alwayes leaue ſome blemiſhes or ſmaller errours; which no more are to be aſcribed to Chriſt, or the holy Ghoſt, then Ignorance, wherof doubtles there is ſome in the Church: I anſwer, as the husbād who is head of the wife, is not bound to remoue all Ignorance from her, and yet is bound to remoue all errour, wherof great hurt may aryſe, although ſhe may be excuſed by Ignorance: So Chriſt is bound to preſerue the Church from all error, wherof great Euill may enſue, of which kind is all error concerning faith: ſeeing it is a moſt pernicious euill, that the Church ſhould worſhip God with falſe faith, Gods true worſhip chiefly conſiſting in fayth, hope, and charity. Agayne, if the Church only cannot erre in matters neceſſary to ſaluation, then the moſt points of fayth may be called in que-

queſtion, for many things are to be beleiued, which are not abſolutly neceſſary to ſaluation, as that there are Diuine Scriptures, without the fayth whereof, many haue been ſaued, as well before the Scriptures were written, as ſince the (12) tyme of the new Teſtament, in remote Nations. Now I preſume that Caluin will not allow that doubt to be made of the Scriptures.

(12) *Irenæus l.3.c.4.*

Agayne thoſe ſmaller errours are eyther ſuch as do not preiudice the integrity of fayth and mans ſaluation; & then without iuſt cauſe did Luther & all Proteſtants reuolt from the Catholicke Church, with ſo much combuſtion and effuſion of Chriſtian bloud: Or if they do preiudice fayth & ſaluation, then they are not ſmall, but waighty errours, & ſuch, as therewith the Church cannot ſtand. For Whitaker confeſſeth, that (13) *If any fundamentall point of doctrine be remoued, the Church preſently falleth*; but no man will deny that ſuch things as preiudice fayth and ſaluation, are fundamentall, vnleſſe he will ſpeake ſo abſurdly and contradictory as Whitaker doth in the ſame place, affirming that, *The Church may erre for a tyme in ſome foundations, and yet be ſound.* So that you muſt imagine a Church to be ſound, and yet fayle in the foundation.

(13) *Controu. 2.q.5.c.27.*

Yea directly contrary to Whitaker, S. Paul calleth the Church, (14) *The pillar and ground of truth.* This text is ſo plaine in our behalfe, that Proteſtants labour extremely to auoyd the ſame. (15) Caluin and others anſwere, that the is only ſo called, becauſe ſhe is a faythfull keeper of the truth, preſeruing the Scriptures. But this maketh for me, for if ſhe be a faythfull keeper of the truth, how then doth ſhe erre? for in erring ſhe doth not keep the truth, but depart from it. And if it be only vnderſtood that ſhe kept the written word from periſhing; then in that ſenſe, Libraries, Sationers ſhops, and Arkes, may be called Pillars and grounds of truth: neyther is heer any mention made of Scriptures, but abſolutely the *Church* is called *the Pillar and ground of truth:* Beſides the *Church* was *a Pillar of Truth*, when there were not any Scriptures to be preſerued.

(14) *1. Tim. 3.15.*

(15) *Calu. in Tim. V Hiſtor. cont. Staplet. fol. 280. Vrſinus Comment. Catech. fol. 17. Rem. Confer. pa. 639.*

(16) *Controu. 2.q.4.c.2.p. 483.*

Whitaker further anſwereth, that (16) *not ſimply euery truth*

truth, but only neceſſary is vnderſtood in this place, Anſwerably to which ſaith Vorſtius, (17) *The Apoſtle treateth not of euery truth in any reſpect belonging to Religion, but only of ſauing truth, or neceſſary to Saluation to be knowne; and this conditionally, to wit, ſo long as she perſeuereth the true Church of Chriſt.* Or (as Peter Martyr ſayth) (18) *I confeſſe she is truly the Pillar of Truth, but not alwaies, but when she relyeth vpon the word of God.* Or as others ſay, (19) *She erreth not as long as she relyeth vpon Chriſt the Rocke, and the foundation of Prophets and Apoſtles.* Or as Bullinger writeth, (20) *the Church erreth not when she heareth the voyce of her ſpouſe & Paſtor.* But all this is ſo impertinent, that with the ſame limitations, I may truely affirme any Cobler or Tinker, any Hereticke or Deuill, to be the Pillar of truth: for none of theſe erre ſo long as they rely vpon Chriſt, and the word of God. And indeed it is all one as to ſay, She is the Pillar of truth, whileſt ſhe is the Pillar of truth. So idle is all this.

(17) *In Antibel. p. 143.*

(18) In loc. Claſ. 4. c. 4. §. 21.

(19) *Conf. ſ. Helvet. c. 17.*

(20) *Decad. 4. ſerm. 5. fol. 229.*

Againe, Proteſtants muſt vnderſtand here, either all Truth, or but ſome Truth: if they meane that ſome truth is euer in the Church only, and ſhe in that reſpect the *Pillar of Truth*, that cannot be ſo, for ſome truth is euer alſo among hereticks, and yet is not their Congregation *the pillar of Truth*. And if they meane that all Truth is euer in the Church only, then we haue our intent, that the Church cannot erre, ſeeing euery error is a deniall of ſome truth. Laſtly, Chemnitius (21) and Reinolds anſwere, *that the Apoſtle calling the Church the Pillar of Truth, meant only, that she ought to be the Pillar of Truth, and ſo though not alwayes indeed, yet alwayes in office and duty, she is the Pillar of Truth, euen when she erreth*: Euen as in like manner the Prieſt is called (22) *The Meſſenger of the Lord of Hoſts*, not for that he did alwayes the Lords meſſage truly, but for that he alwaies had authority ſo to do. I anſwere this ſhift is no better then any of the former, the Compariſon being moſt vnlike, for though it were granted, that the *Prieſt* did not Gods meſſage alwaies truly, yet was he alwaies truly and indeed Gods Meſſenger, receiuing that name and office, not from the meſſage done, but from the authority & charge, giuen him to do the ſame: for the word *Meſſenger*, is a word of Office, reſpecting only an authority

(21) *Exam. part. 2. p. 10. Rein. Confer. p. 652. c. 9.*

(22) *Mal. 2. 7.*

&

&charge of a thing not already done, or preſently in doing, but hereafter to be done, namely of the meſſage to be executed, & ſo euen before the meſſage done, the party is actually inueſted in that office, in reſpect only of the authority and charge, which actually he enioyeth? As in like, Kings Embaſſadours are actually for the tyme Embaſſadours, before they do their Embaſſy, or although they do it vntruly. But theſe words which the Apoſtle referreth to the Church, are of another nature, being titles not of Office only, but of Priuiledge, reſpecting an action ſtill preſent. And ſo the Church, is in this place alſo called the *Houſe of God*, for that God ſtill dwelleth in her; and in the next words, ſhe is termed *The Pillar of Truth*. Becauſe (euen as (23) Reynolds himſelfe ſayth) *it beareth vp the Truth and confirmeth it*: for no man cā ſay of the Church, that ſhe is the *Houſe of God*, when God dwelleth not in her; or that ſhe is actually the *Pillar of Truth* when ſhe erreth, as on the other part it may be ſayd in the example obiected of the *Prieſt*, that he is actually Gods Meſſenger, and may ſo be called euen before his meſſage done, or though he erre therein: As alſo in like manner he is truly his *Prieſt*, though he ſhould erre in the function thereof. (24) Caluin himſelfe confeſſeth thus much, ſpeaking of the Iewes Church when it had reuolted, in which notwithſtanding he then acknowledgeth peculiar prerogatiues of the Church, and yet in reſpect of the Reuolt and defection of thoſe times, he ſayth thereof, *If thoſe be Churches, then is the Church not the Pillar of Truth &c. not the Tabernacle of the liuing God:* whereas if the foreſayd anſwere were good, the Church reuolted, which he ſpeaketh of, was euen the Pillar of Truth, becauſe as then ſhe ought to haue been ſuch. To conclude, as the Church is euer actually, and indeed *The houſe of God:* So is ſhe euer actually and indeed *the Pillar of Truth:* and vnto her, as *Gods houſe* the faithfull ought to reſort to be taught, as the Prophet foretelleth of Chriſts Church, ſaying. (25) *Come let vs aſcend to the Houſe of the God of Iacob, and he ſhall teach vs his wayes*. The ſame is proued by ſuch places as argue that lawfull Councels cannot erre. If the firſt Councell ſaid confidently, (26) *It hath ſeemed good to*

(23) *Conſer. p. 639.*

(24) *In Hit. impreſſ. Antigentor. c. 4. deſide. p. 247.*

(25) *Iſa. 2. 3. Mich. 4. 2.*

(26) *Act. 15. 28.*

the holy Ghoſt & to vs, ſo auouching the decrees therof to be the decrees of the holy Ghoſt, then the like may ſay other Councels, the holy Ghoſt no leſſe aſſiſting them for the good of the Church. Chriſt himſelfe alſo (27) promiſeth his owne perpetuall and preſent aſſiſtance, ſaying, *Where two or three are gathered togeather in my name, there am I in the middeſt of them.* But for the better vnderſtanding hereof, obſerue, that our Sauiour ſpeaking before of the incorrigible man, ſaid, *Tell the Church, and if he will not heare the Church &c.* Now leaſt any ſhould thinke that the Church might be contemned or diſobeyed, he annexeth immediatly, *Whatſoeuer yee ſhall bynd vpon Earth &c.* And leaſt any ſhould doubt of Gods aſſiſtance, when the Paſtors of the Church aſſembled do condemne or abſolue any man, therfore it followeth, *Where two or three are gathered in my name, there am I in the middeſt of them. And concerning euery thing whatſoeuer they ſhal aske it ſhalbe done to them of my Father &c.* Now what requeſt more iuſt & neceſſary, then to be able infallibly to diſcerne truth from falſhood?

(27) *Mat.* 18. 20.

(28) *Io.* 16. 13 & 14. 26.
(29) *Controu.* 2. *quæſt.* 4. *c.* 2. *p.* 486. 488.
(30) *Theſ.* 2. *Bucanus loc.* 41.
(31) *Controu.* 4. *p.* 612.
(32) *In Scuto. p.* 52.
(33) *Cypr. l.* 4. *Epiſt. Baſil. Conſtit. Monaſt. c.* 23.
(34) *Fulk. Rhem. Teſt. in Luc.* 10. 16.
(35) *Io.* 14. 16.

Chriſt ſpeaking of the cõming of the holy Ghoſt, ſayth, (28) *when he is come which is the ſpirit of Truth, we will lead you into all truth*: Whitaker would euade this, ſaying, (29) *I anſwere, Chriſt and the holy Ghoſt do teach the Church all truth, ſimply neceſſary, but often do leaue ſome error*: And the ſame anſwere is giuen by Reinolds (30) and others. But this is contrary to the text which ſayth, that the holy Ghoſt *will lead into all truth*. Neither would this be ſufficient direction for Chriſtians, who are not able to diſcerne, what truth is ſimply neceſſary, and what not. Daneus therfore reſtrayneth this only to the Apoſtles, ſaying (31) *This promiſe of Chriſt belongeth properly and truly to thoſe twelue whom he then ſpoke vnto: Therfore it is a perſonall benefit, which cannot be extended to others then thoſe twelue Apoſtles.* And the ſame anſwere is made by Molineus. (32) But S. Cyprian (33) and S. Baſill apply this to their *Succeſſors*. And Fulke confeſſeth, that, (34) *It is all one to deſpiſe the Miniſter of Chriſts Catholicke Church, and to deſpiſe Chriſt.* And that this is not ſpoken only to the Apoſtles, but alſo to their Succeſſors, is manifeſt, in that the ſaid Spirit is promiſed to abyde with the *Apoſtles* (35) *for euer*, that is, with them and

and their Succeſſors. And ſo Chriſt himſelfe ſayth, (36) *I will aske the Father, & he will giue you another Cõforter, that he may abide with you for euer, the Spirit of truth, which* (37) *ſhal teach you all truth.* And accordingly he prayeth after to his Father, not only for the Church of that age, but alſo for the Church in all ages following, in theſe words: (38) *And not for them only do I pray, but for thoſe alſo, that by their word ſhall believe in me.* So expreſly is Chriſts Church ſãctified for euer in the truth of this word.

(36) Io. 14. 16. (37) Io. 16. 13. (38) Io. 17. 20.

Now, the holy Ghoſt doth not teach all truth to euery particular man, or Biſhops being apart, therfore when they are aſſembled togeather. Fulke further replyeth, that euery true Chriſtian may erre, & yet is no true Chriſtiã voyd of Chriſts Spirit; for as the Apoſtle teacheth, (39) *He that hath not the Spirit of Chriſt, is none of his.* But this is but a deceiptful euaſiõ, for the guift of Chriſts ſpirit is not alwais one; it is one in the whole Church, & another in euery true Chriſtiã, we ſpeake heer of that particular ſpirit which is the (40) *Spirit of truth, which doth teach al truth*; the guifts of this Spirit (I ſay) be not alwaies one, but it diſtributeth as the Apoſtle affirmeth (41) *Differẽt guiftes*, & therfore though euery true Chriſtian hath Chriſts Spirit to Satisfaction, yet hath he not thereby, his ſpeciall guift of the Spirit of Truth, whereof we now ſpeake, no more then he hath the guift of prophecying, and of miracles.

(39) Rom. 8. 9. (40) Io. 16. 3. (41) Rom 12. 6.

Of Biſhops & chiefe Paſtours it is ſaid, (42) *He that heareth you, heareth me, and he that deſpiſeth you, deſpiſeth me:* (43) *Obey your Prelates and be ſubiect to them:* they are called *Paſtors*, (44) or Shepheards, and (45) *teachers.* (46) *And he gaue ſome Apoſtles, & ſome Prophets, & other ſome Euangeliſts, and other ſome Paſtors & Doctors, to the conſũmation of the Saints, vnto the worke of the miniſtery vnto the edifiing of the body of Chriſt, vntill we meet all into the vnity of fayth &c.* And now followeth the reaſon why Chriſt prouideth theſe Paſtors in his Church; *That now we be not Children wauering & carried about with euery wynd of doctrine, in the wickednes of men, in craftines to the Circũuention of Errour.* So prouidently doth God preſerue his Church againſt euery *wynd of falſe doctrine, and Circumuention of Error.* Accordingly as the Prophet foretould, calling the Church of Chriſt (47) *a direct way, ſo that fooles cannot erre in it.* Now, if we be commanded by

(42) Luc. 10. 10. (43) Heb. 13. 17. (44) Eph. 4. 11. (45) Mat. 28. 19. (46) Eph. 4. 11. (47) Iſa 35. 8

by God to follow and heare them as our *Prelates, Paſtors, and Doctours*; then either they cannot erre, or erring, and we following them therin, we may lay the fault vpon God, who commanded vs to follow them: And then ſeeing euery Biſhop apart, or ſeuerall from the reſt may erre, it followeth, that many lawfully aſſembled in Councell togeather cannot erre.

The ſame is proued by all ſuch texts as conuince, that the Head, or Chiefe Biſhop of the Church cannot erre in defyning matters of faith, (48) *Simon, Simon, Sathan hath deſired you, that he might winnow you as wheat, but I haue prayed for thee, that thy faith may not fayle.* Here Chriſt prayeth not for all the Church, but in particular for Peter, as all the words ſhow, *Simon, for thee, thy fayth, thy brethren*: Alſo whereas our Sauiour began to ſpeake in the Plurall number, *Sathan hath deſired that he might winnow you* (vos) forthwith he changeth his manner of ſpeaking, and ſayth, *but I haue prayed for thee*: further he prayeth for him to whom he ſayth, *and thou ſometimes conuerted*, which cannot agree to the whole Church, except we will ſay the whole Church to haue been firſt peruerted, which is many wayes vntrue. But now that which Chriſt prayed for, is expreſly, that *his faith ſhould not faile*, and then ſeeing this prayer for Peter, was for the good of the Church, the Deuill ſtill deſiring to winnow the faithfull, it therof followeth, that ſhe neuer wanteth one, whoſe faith may not faile, by whom ſhe may be confirmed. Againe, Peter is called (49) a *Rocke, and foundation*, both which argue firmenes; for a *Rock* is not broken with wynd or tempeſt, and if the *foundation* fall, all the whole houſe falleth withall.

(48) *Luc.* 22. 32.

(49) *Mat.* 16. 18.

Againe, if the Church could erre, then there were no meanes left to decyde controuerſies, and preſerue vnity: yea all former decrees of the Church, and many condemned hereſies therby would be called in queſtion. And we ſhould euer remayne vncertaine of ſundry parts of Scripture it ſelfe, the authority wherof was holden doubtfull, vntill they were approued as Canonicall by the Church and her Councels. And if the church can erre, how can Proteſtants be

be assured that their Church doth not erre, in condemning the Roman Church of superstition? Or how can the vulgar be sure they are taught the truth, when their Teachers themselues confesse, that their Church, and all their Pastors may lye?

And lastly, if the Church can erre, one of these absurdities must ensue, that either Christ may sometimes be without a Church, an Espouse in Earth, (as he was all the while there were no Protestants, if their Church be the Spouse of Christ) or else, if the Catholicke Church only is, and hath been his wyfe and spouse, and the same haue such Errors as Hereticks falsly pretend; then his wyfe so deare (50) and so praised, is notwithstanding a very whore: this so grosse absurdity conuinceth, both that the Catholicke Church alwaies is, and that it teacheth truth alwayes. (50) *Eph.* 5. 26.

In briefe, (51) *if the Church be the Pillar of Truth, if it hath the spirit of God to lead it into all truth till the worlds end; If it be builded vpon a Rock, and hell gates shall not preuayle against it; If Christ hath placed in it Apostles, Doctors, Pastors, and Rulers, to the Consummation,* and full perfection of the whole body, that in the meane tyme *we be not carryed away with euery blast of doctrine:* If *Christ haue prayed for it that the faith of the chiefe Gouernour therof do not fayle:* If *it be his house, his Spouse, his body, his lot, kingdome and inheritance giuen him in this world: If he loueth it as his owne flesh,* and it cannot be diuorced or separated from him: Lastly if the new Testament, Scriptures, Sacraments, and Sacrifice cannot be changed, being the euerlasting dowry of the Church, continued euer in this our Catholicke Church; then certainty it cannot erre. So plaine then are so many textes of Scripture in proofe that the Church cannot erre. (51) *Io.* 14. 16. *Mat.* 16. *mar.* 28. *Eph.* 4. *Io* 17. *Luc.* 22. *Ps.* 2. *Eph.* 5.

SECT. III.

That the Fathers do expound the Scriptures, in proofe that the Church of Christ cannot erre.

SAint Cyprian (or rather as some thinke Ruffinus) speaking of the Church sayth, (1) *This is the holy Church not hauing* (1) *De symbolo Apost.*

uing blot or wrinkle &c. The Churches of Heretikes are not without blot or wrinkle of vntruth, and therefore the Prophet ſayd of them, (3) I haue hated the Church of the malignant, but of this Church which keepeth the fayth of Chriſt whole, the holy Ghoſt ſayth, (4) my Doue is one.

(1) Eph 5. v. 27.
(3) Pſ. 25. 5.
(4) Cant. 6. 8.

S. Auſtine directeth vs to the Church for the fynding out of all truth, ſaying, (5) The truth of Scriptures is houlden by vs when we do that, which now hath pleaſed the vniuerſall Church, which the authority of the ſame Scriptures doth commend, that ſeeing the holy Scripture cannot deceiue, whoſoeuer feareth to be deceiued by the obſcurity of this queſtion, let him take Counſayle thereof from the Church, which without any ambiguity the holy Scripture doth demonſtrate. S. Lucius Pope and martyr (6) affirmeth that, The Roman Church is Apoſtolicall, and the Mother of all Churches, which is neuer proued to haue erred from the path of Apoſtolicall tradition; nor depraued with Hereticall Nouelties, to haue fayled according to the promiſe of our Lord himſelfe ſaying, I haue prayed for thee that thy fayth fayle not.

(5) L. 2. Cont. Creſc. c. 33.
(6) Ep. 1. ad Epiſcopos Hiſp. & Galliæ.

That the Fathers taught from Scripture, that Councells could not erre, appeareth by S. Cyril, who ſpeaking of the Biſhops of the Councell of Nice, who made the Creed, ſayth, (7) Truly with them ſate Chriſt himſelfe, who ſayd, when two or three ſhalbe gathered in my name, there I am in the middeſt of them: for how can it be doubted, that he did inuiſibly rule that holy and great Synod? As alſo in that the ſayd words of Chriſt are cyted and vrged in proofe that Generall Councells cannot erre, by the Conncell of (8) Chalcedon, by the ſixt Synode, by the third Toletan Councell, by Innocentius & Celeſtinus. S. Auſtin in another place ſayth, (9) Number the Prieſts euen frō the ſea of Peter, obſerue who in that ranck of fathers ſucceedeth one another, that is the Rock which the Proud gates of Hell do not ouercome. In proofe of the ſupreme Paſtors freedome from erring, I may alledge that, Theodoret writeth to Pope Leo in theſe words, If (10) Paul the preacher of truth, the trumpet of the Holy Ghoſt ranne to great Peter, that from him he might bring the anſwere (or reſolution) to them who contended at Antiochia concerning the legall ordinances; much more we, who are abiect and litle, do runne to your Apoſtolicall Sea, that we may re-

(7) Cyr. Alex. in Expoſ. Symb. Nicæni.
(8) Epi ad Leon. quæ eſt poſt tertiam Act. eiuſdem cont. Syn. 6. Act. 17. Tol. 3. propè init. Innoc. diſp. 20. can. de quibus. Celeſt. ep. ad Conc. Epheſ. primum.
(9) In Pſ. cont. part. Donat.
(10) Ad Leonem Papam.

ceiue

ceiue from you, remedy for the wounds of the Churches. S. Bernard writeth thus to Pope Innocentius, (11) *It is meete that all dangers and ſcandals of the kingdome of God* (or Church) *be brought to your Apoſtleſhip, thoſe eſpecially which concerne faith. For I thinke it conuenient, that there chiefly the domages of Faith ſhould be repayred, where faith cannot feele defect; for to what other Sea was it euer ſaid, I haue prayed for thee that thy faith faile not.* So cleerly do the Fathers and Councels expound the Scriptures, in proof that the Church, Generall Councels, or the Supreme Paſtor of the Church cannot erre in matters of faith.

(11) Ep. 190. ad Innocen.

SECT. IV.

Proteſtant writers teach, that the Church of Chriſt cannot erre in matters of fayth.

THe place before cited out of the Prophet Iſay, is ſo cleere for the Churches not erring, as that the Gloſſers vpon the Engliſh Proteſtant tranſlation, confeſſe the truth therof in the marginall notes vpon that place: Caluin commenting vpon the ſame place ſayth, (1) *God promiſeth that his Church ſhall neuer be ſpoyled of this ineſtimable good, but that it ſhalbe gouerned by the holy Ghoſt, and vnderpropped with heauenly doctrine &c.* And a litle after, *ſuch is the promiſe that our Lord will ſo aſſiſt his Church, and will haue that protection and care of it, as he will neuer permit it to be depriued of his doctrine*: what more cleere could be ſpoken by a Catholicke?

(1) *In Iſa. c. 50.*

But no man deliuereth his mynd more freely in this point then Luther, *The* (2) *Church* (ſayth he) *cannot erre, but euery man may erre in his deuotion &c. The Church is gouerned by the holy Ghoſt.* Againe (3) *they are inforced to confeſſe the Church to be the Rocke againſt which the gates of hell cannot preuayle. Matt. 16. or as Paul expoundeth, the Pillar and groundworke of truth &c. Therfore the Church neyther will nor can ſuffer a lye & falſe doctrine.* Yea, (4) *The Church neyther ought nor can lye, nor teach errours, not in the leaſt things, ſeeing God is the mouth of the Church: & as God cannot lye, ſo alſo neyther the Church.* And (5) *the vniuerſall Church cannot erre, as the Cardinall Cameracenſis proueth moſt learnedly,*

(2) *De decem preceptis.*
(3) To 7. *Ger. Vvit. de vet. Eccl. fol.* 362.
(4) Tom. 7. *de Antiqua Eccleſia f.* 362. *Germ.*
(5) *Reſp. ad Dialog Situe-Stri Priorat.*

vpon the first of the Sentences. Yea sayth he (6) *It is dangerous & fearefull to heare or beleiue any thing which is contrary to the vnanimous testimony of sayth, and the doctrine of the holy Catholike Church, which from the beginning she hath kept with one consent for 1500. yeares.* And, (7) *I protest* (sayth Luther) *first, that I will neyther speake or bould any thing, but first that which is had, and may be had in and from the sacred Scriptures; then from Ecclesiasticall Fathers receyued by the Roman Church, hitherto obserued; and from the Canons and Decretals of the Pope. But if any thing cannot be proued or disproued from these, that will I only hould for disputation sake.* If Luther had performed this his iust protestation, he had neuer bin condemned by the Church for an Heretike.

(6) *Epist. ad Marchion. Brandeburr. Tom. 2. Germ. fol. 324.*
(7) *In Protestatione.*
(8) *Act. mon. p. 999*
(9) *Ibid. 1361.*
(10) *Ib pag. 1186.*
(11) *Ibid. pag. 1401.*
(12) *Ib p. 1111.*
(13) *Ib. pag. 493.*
(14) *Ib. p. 464.*
(15) In his Serm. preached 8. Feb. 1588. Hun. Act Colloq. Ratisb. fol. 105. Keker. in System. Theol. Pow. of things indifferent. c. 2 p 7.
(16) Discourse of the Church. c. 11. p. 198.
(17) De Relig Christ. c. 14 §. 10. p. 319.

Would any man thinke it credible that Fox and many of his canonized Saints, who so obstinately opposed and disobeyed the Church, should expressely teach, that the Church cannot erre; and yet I find that Fox himselfe saith, (8) *The true Church Christ neuer suffereth to erre in the whole.* Ridley (9) *I do acknowledge an vnspotted Church of Christ, in which no man can erre, without which no man can be saued.* And, (10) *the Catholicke Church is the Spouse of Christ, the Pillar and stay of truth, this Church I beleiue according to the Creed.* Philpot, (11) *I do not thinke that the Catholike Church can erre in doctrine.* Bradford calleth the Church, (12) *Christs wyfe, the Chayre and seat of verity.* Iames Bainhams opinion was, that, *There be two Churches, the Church of Christ, and the Church of Antichrist; the Church of Antichrist doth and may erre, and the Church of Christ not.* Bilney auoucheth that (14) *the Catholicke Church can by no meanes erre in sayth.* And the same truth of the Church not erring, is taught by (15) D. Bancroft, Hunnius, Kekermanus, and Powell. Bertrand de Loque sayth of this very question, (16) *The Controuersy in my Iudgement is not of the Catholicke* (or vniuersall) *Church, for we all agree herein, that she cannot erre touching sayth &c. Wherefore this question is, touching (only) a particular Church:* but that a particular Church may erre Catholikes do not deny. In this sense also is S. Paul expounded by Zanchius, saying, (17) *We beleiue and acknowledge this Catholicke Church, which we haue aboue described, so to be gouerned by the spirit of Christ, that he will neuer suffer all the same at once*

to

to erre &c. Whereto we doubt not to pertayne that which Paul ſayd, The Church to be the Pillar and foundation of truth, becauſe out of the Church there is no truth, but in it, it is perpetually kept, ſeeing alwayes ſome company great or little may be found, in which the word of truth ſoundeth. But of every particular Church we haue learned the reaſon to be vnlike. In like ſort ſayth Rhegius, (18) *We graunt that although particular Churches may erre, yet the whole Church cannot erre altogether, for the promiſes of God do withſtand it.*

(18) Diſcuſſ. Theol. p. 113. See Hunnius in Acta Colloq. Ratisb. f. 103.

Huſſe alſo in this is very liberall ſaying, (19) *I admit all the doctrines of holy Doctours, declaring faythfully the law it ſelfe: I reuerence alſo all generall and particular Councells, Decrees, and Decretals, & all lawes, Cannons, and Conſtitutions.* And concerning Councells which do repreſent the Church, Luthers opinion was that, (20) *If the world ſhall longer continue, it willbe againe for the different interpretations of Scripture, which now are, to preſerue vnity of fayth, that we receiue the Decrees of Councels, and fly to them.* Againe, (21) *I haue not ſaid nor counſailed, neither is it my intention, that one or ſome Biſhops by proper authority beginne to giue to any one both kinds, vnles it ſhould be ſo ordained and commanded in a Generall Councell.* So reſpective in this humour was Luther to a Generall Councell. D. Bilſon acknowledgeth with Councels, the preſence and aſſiſtance (22) *of the holy Ghoſt.* And, that *they are ſtrengthned with the promiſe of our Sauiour.* Ridley affirmeth that (23) *Councels do indeed repreſent the whole Church, and being ſo gathered togather in the name of Chriſt, they haue a promiſe of the guift, and guiding of his ſpirit into all truth.* Thus do many of the chiefeſt Proteſtants expound the Scriptures in behalfe of the Church not erring, and believe and teach the ſame doctrine themſelues.

(19) *Serm de fidei ſuæ elucidatione.*

(20) *Cont. Stanglium & Ocolamp.*

(21) *In Declaratione Euchariſtiæ.*

(22) *Perpet. Gouern. pag.* 171.

(23) *Act. mon. p.* 1188.

SECT. V.

Obiections from Scripture, in proofe that the Church may erre in matters of fayth, anſwered.

SOme obiect that Aaron, and the whole multitude adored the golden calfe. But the Anſwere is eaſy, for Aaron was not then inueſted with the authority of high Prieſt, but that office was imparted long after vnto him, as appeareth

in Exodus c.40. Neither did the Leuits conſent to that Idolatrie, or Moyſes in whom the ſupreme Prieſtly dignity ſtill remayned; ſo many wayes impertinent is this Obiection. Such places are alſo obiected, as ſeeme to argue all Paſtors, Prieſts and Prophets, not only of euill life, but euen of ignorance or error. *His* (1) *watchmen* [*all blynd haue been ignorant &c. The Paſtours themſelues haue byn ignorant of vnderſtanding*. Anſwere. It is frequent in Scriptures (2) for the faults of ſome, all to be reprehended in generall, that ſo the reprehenſion may ſeeme more vehement: and this is obſerued by S. Auſtine. (3) Yea Iewell himſelfe doth acknowledge that, *In* (4) *the holy Scriptures, this word, All, is often vſed inſteed of many.* Againe, theſe reprehenſions concerne Prieſts as they are ſeuerall, not as they are aſſembled in any lawfull Councell togeather. Neither is it neceſſary that theſe things which are ſpoken againſt the Prieſts of the old Teſtament, ſhould be applied alſo to theſe of the new, eſpecially aſſembled in Councell, the Church hauing greater promiſes from God, then the Synagogue had, of which it was neuer ſaid; *Vpon this Rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell ſhall not preuayle againſt it*, with ſundry ſuch like.

(1) Iſa. 56. 10. Ierem. 6. 13.
(2) Mat. 2. 3. Luc 10 15.
(3) De Ciu. Dei. l c. 11.
(4) Defence. p. 442.

Some vrge thoſe words of Chriſt, (5) *But yet the ſonne of man cõming ſhall he fynd, trow you, faith in the earth?* as though at Chriſts coming all faith ſhould be ceaſed, and ſo the Church to haue erred and periſhed. Anſwer. The Ancient hereticks Luciferians, and Donatiſts, as Proteſtants now do, vſed this place to excuſe their fall from the Church; ſaying it was decayed in faith, when they forſooke it: to whom S. Hierome (6) and S. Auguſtine anſwered; that Chriſt ſayth not, that there ſhould be no faith left in earth, but by this manner of ſpeech inſinuateth, that at the latter day in the great perſecution of Antichriſt, faith ſhould be more rare, eſpecially that perfect faith, containing deuotion and affection towards God. Rogers obiecteth (7) that at the death of Chriſt, the chiefe Prieſt, with the reſt of the Prieſts and the people erred in fayth, condemning our Sauiour as guilty of death, and denying him to be the Meſſias, accordingly as was foretould by the Prophet, (8) *The law ſhall periſh from the Prieſts, &*

(5) Luc. 18. 8.
(6) Hieron. Lucif. c. 6. Aug. de vnit. Eccleſiæ. c. 15. & de verb. Dom. Serm. 36.
(7) Def of the Art. art. 21. p. 116.
(8) Ezech. 7. 26.

Coun-

Counſaile from the Elders: As alſo that at the ſame time the apoſtles loſt their faith. Anſwer. 1. The Chiefe Prieſt and the reſt were not aſſembled to expound the Law, or teach the people, but to pronounce ſentence in a matter of fact; in which no man doubteth but that they might erre. 2. The Priuiledge of not erring was graunted to thoſe Prieſts, but vntill the tyme of Chriſts comming; and of it the Prophet ſaid, *The Law ſhall perish from the Prieſts*: but the New Teſtament is to continue vnto the worlds end, and to it the promiſe was made *for* (9) *euer*, and that *the* (10) *gates of hel ſhould not preuaile againſt it*. 3. As for the reſt of the people, to many of them theſe iniuries to Chriſt were moſt diſpleaſing, as to Nicodemus, Ioſeph of Arimathia, and others. And to many others in Iudea, and ſundry other parts of the world they were altogeather vnknowne, who therfore remayned at the ſame tyme faithfull. And ſo accordingly Proteſtants tell vs of (11) *Zacharie, Symeon, Ioſeph, Elizabeth, Marie, Anne, the teachers, and many others, who agreed in pure doctrine and did not beare the Phariſees and Saducees*; many of whom being then liuing, neuer conſented to Chriſts condemnation. Yea Caiphas himſelfe did not erre in faith, when he (12) ſaid, *that it was expedient that one man dye for the people, and the whole nation perish not. And this he ſaid not of himſelfe, but being the high Prieſt of that yeare, he prophecyed, that Ieſus ſhould dy for the Nation &c.* And as for the Apoſtles they were not as then Biſhops, but only deſigned. Neither is it probable, that they as then did erre in fayth; for though it be ſaid that, (13) *He reproued their incredulity*, yet this doth not ſignify that they loſt their faith which they had, but only that they were ſlow to beliue that which they had not formerly beliued, to wit, our Sauiours reſurrection, wherof when himſelfe had ſaid, (14) *They will kill him, but the third day he ſhall ryſe againe*; it is imediatly ſaid, *but they vnderſtood none of theſe things*. And S. Iohn giueth the reaſon hereof: (15) *For as yet they knew not the ſcripture, that he ſhould ryſe againe from the dead*. Beſides the B. Virgin Mary, & S. Mary Magdalen and others, continued as then with great Charity, which neceſſarily preſuppoſeth fayth. Againe, the ſtate of Chriſts Church with obligation to enter therinto, did

(9) *Pſ* 88.29. *Iſa*. 54. *Ier*. 31. 31.

(10) *Mat*. 17. 18.

(11) Harm. of Confeſſ. pag. 326.

(12) Io. 11. 49.

(13) *Mar*. 16. 14.

(14) *Luc*. 18. 33. 34.

(15) Io. 20. 9.

did but beginne at Pentecoſt, when the Apoſtles preached publickly the faith of Chriſt. Laſtly Proteſtants acknowledge, that the Church cannot erre in matters neceſſary to ſaluation, wherfore if they charge the whole Church with this damnable error, they therin impugne themſelues no leſſe then vs. For ſo ſayth Willet, (16) *The Church of God may erre in ſome points not neceſſary to Saluation, but* (ſhe) *cannot fall into any dãnable error*, & the like is taught by (37) Fulk & Caluin, ſo many waies doth appeare the weaknes of this Obiection. *Fulke* (18) vrged frõ S. Paul, (19) *That our knowledge is imperfect, our prophecying imperfect*; therefore the doctrine of the Church may alſo be imperfect or erroneous. Anſwer. Fulke may as well cõclude that therfore S. Pauls doctrine & writings may be erroneous, for this his ſaying cõcerneth himſelfe, as much as the Church; we muſt therefore vnderſtand, that S. Paul in this place (as is affirmed by S. Auſtine (20) and is otherwiſe manifeſt by the (21) Circumſtance of the text) onely inſinuateth our knowledge in this life not to be ſo cleer & manifeſt, as it ſhalbe in the next life, ſaying to this end in the place cyted; *we ſee now by a glaſſe in a darke ſort, but then face to face: now I know in part*, (for which Fulke tranſlateth falſly, *imperfectly*) *but then I ſhall know, as alſo I am knowne*. Which knowledge of the Church, although in this ſenſe and reſpect, it be, and euer was but in part, yet it hath been, and ſtill is ſo certaine in it ſelfe, that ſhe may be bould to ſay in her determinations, (22) *It hath ſeemed good to the holy Ghoſt and vs*. Rogers obiecteth that (23) Generall Councells conſiſting of men, who may erre, and who are all lyars, God only being true, that therefore they are ſubiect to errour. Anſwer. Though men of themſelues be all ſubiect to errour, yet God being true, who hath promiſed in that caſe to be in the middeſt of them, the danger of errour is taken away. 2. Though euery man be of himſelfe a lyar, yet may ſome men notwithſtanding by Gods ſpeciall grace, be true and no lyars, as the Euangeliſts and Apoſtles of Chriſts, againſt whoſe doctrine and writing this argument maketh as much, as againſt the Church, vnto which the direction of the holy Ghoſt is no leſſe promiſed, then to the Apoſtles and

(16) Willet. Synop. p. 51.
(17) Againſt Rhem. Teſt. p 122, 168. 169 336. 373. 372. Cal. Inſtit. Argent. pa. 369.
(18) Anſ. to a Counterf. Cath. p. 89.
(19) 1. Cor. 13. 9.
(20) Cited by Bede vpon this place.
(21) 1. Cor. 13. 10, 12.
(22) *Act.* 15. 28.
(23) Def. of the Art. art. 21. p. 115. Fulk. Anſwere to a Counterfet Cath. p. 86.

and Euangelists. Whitaker and Reynolds argue thus (24) That which befalleth to one, may befall to the whole: but euery one in particular may erre, therefore the whole may erre. This is a poore sophisme, for in the lyke sort might I argue, Whitaker cannot remoue a milstone, nor Reynolds, nor any other Minister; therefore all the Ministers in the world togeather, cannot remoue a Milstone. So though particular Pastours of the Church may erre, yet not the whole Church, especially it being guarded by Gods promise, and the assistance of the holy Ghost. But Whitaker and Fulke reply, (23) That the holy Ghost is promised to euery one in particular, Christ prayed to sanctify euery one, and confirme him in verity, as he did for the whole, for the laity, aswell as for the Clergy. Answere. It is true that he promised to euery particular, and prayed for them, but in a different manner, to euery one according to their seuerall state and degree: he prayed for S. Peter, and the rest of the Apostles, and Bishops their successours, and assured them the holy Ghost; as to parents, maisters, and sheepheards of his fold; to the Laity and euery particular man, as to Children, schollars, and sheep to be directed by them: they haue the holy Ghost to teach, preach, and gouerne; these to obey, learne, and belieue. Wherfore as the Pastours cannot erre in teaching, defyning, and condemning heresies; so neyther any particular man in belieuing, obeying, and submitting himselfe vnto them.

(24) Contro. 2 q. 4. c. 3. Rem. inhis 2. Concl.

(23) Contr. 2. q. 4. c. 2. Fulk. me. 16. 10. sec. 5.

Thus haue Prot. like vnshamefast Children, sought (though with small successe) to discouer the nakednes of their spirituall mother, Christs Spouse.

CHAP. III.

The true State of the Queſtion, concerning the difficulty in vnderſtanding the ſacred Scriptures.

Whether the Sacred Scriptures be ſo eaſy and plaine to be vnderſtood, as that without the explication of the Church, they are ſufficient to decyde, and end all controuerſies of fayth, or rather in many places are very obſcure and difficult, euen to the learned.

SECT. I.

Catholicke Doctrine.

AMONGST other reaſons that conuince the ſole Scripture, not to be our Iudge of Controuerſies, is the extreme difficulty in fynding out the true Senſe thereof. And therefore in the Councell of Baſil we are taught, that, (1) *Seeing the ſacred Scriptures in many places are hard to be vnderſtood, in the reſoluing of ſuch doubts as aryſe concerning fayth, there doth often happen amongſt learned men variety and multiplicity of Opinions, and as it were an endles difficulty. Wherefore in this difficulty of Scriptures, and variety of Opinions, it is neceſſary to haue recourſe to ſome meaſure or ſquare, by application whereof, truth is diſcerned from falshood, which truly can be nothing els in humane things, then the holy Catholike Church, which we ſuppoſe cannot erre.* (2) All Catholikes agreably teach, that the Scriptures in many places are ſo obſcure, that they need the interpretation

(1) *Concil. Baſil. Orat. Ioan. de Raguſio.*
(2) *Bellar. de verbo Dei. l. 3. c. 1. Rh. Teſt. p. 232. 672. Val. to. 3. d. 1 q. 1. de obiecto fidei p. 212.*

tion of the Church. In which, their meaning is that this obſcurity doth not ariſe through any default of the doctrine therein by God deliuered, but by reaſon of the Maieſty and depth of the wiſedome and knowledge of God taught therby, & through the weakenes of mans vnderſtanding.

Proteſtant Doctrine.

In this queſtion Luthers abſolute decree is this: (3) *I ſay of the whole Scripture, I will haue no part therof to be ſaid to be obſcure.* (4) *The ſacred Scripture is of it ſelfe moſt certaine, moſt eaſy, moſt plaine,* (and) *the expounder of it ſelfe.* D. Fulke is of opinion that, (5) *Whatſoeuer is neceſſary to be knowne, is plainly ſet forth, and eaſy to be vnderſtood of them that will read diligently, marke attentiuely, pray hartily, and iudge humbly.* (6) *That which is queſtioned* (ſayth D. Morton) *is, whether all ſuch things as are neceſſary to ſaluation, are ſo very plaine, that the moſt vnlearned beleeuers, by the reading therof, may be inſtructed to Piety; and Heretickes, though moſt learned, may cleerly inough be confuted by them.* And herein M. Morton holdeth the affirmatiue part. The ſame is taught by (7) Whitaker, and ſundry other Proteſtants. So that according to theſe men, the Myſteries of the B. Trinity, of the Incarnation of Chriſt, of the holy Sacraments, of our Iuſtification &c. are ſo very plaine in the Scriptures, that the moſt vnlearned beleeuers by the reading therof may be inſtructed to Piety, and Heretiks though moſt learned, may cleerly inough be confuted by them. But how falſe all this is, dayly and dolefull experiences do moſt cleerly conuince.

(3) *L. de ſerno Arb. fol.* 440.
(4) *Praf. Aſpert. Artic. à Leone* 10. *damnatorum.*
(5) Againſt Rhem. Teſt in 2. Pet c. 3.
(6) *Apol. part. 2. l. 2. c.* 19.
(7) *Controu.* 1. *q* 4. *c.* 3. *pa.* 341. *& c.* 1. *p.* 135. *Et Controu.* 2. *q.* 5. *c.* 7. *p.* 513. *Perkins Tom.* 2. *fol.* 118.

SECT. II.

That the Scriptures are obſcure and hard to be vnderſtood, it is proued by the Scriptures themſelues.

THe Prophet Dauid, who was a man moſt conuerſant in ſuch Scriptures as were written in his tyme, was skilfull in the Hebrew, and otherwiſe humble, not proud or vnbelieuing; yet he prayeth for the true vnderſtanding of

the Law, or Scriptures, as for a ſpeciall guift from God, ſaying. (1) *Reuele my eyes, and I ſhall conſider the meruailous things of thy Law.* (2) *Teach me thy Iuſtifications.* (3) *Giue me vnderſtanding, and I will ſearch thy law*, and ſundry ſuch like. (4) Proteſtants ordinarily anſwering, that the Scripture of it ſelfe cleere, is made obſcure to the proud and incredulous, through their owne blindnes & wicked affections, will nothing helpe them in this caſe; for Dauid was a man humble, and a true belieuer, and yet he prayeth for the true vnderſtanding of the Law, or Scriptures. Neyther will it ſuffice to anſwere with (5) Brentius, that the Scriptures obſcurity is ſomtymes by reaſon of the Hebrew and Greeke Phraſes, yet the Senſe is euer moſt cleer: for beſides that this ſeemeth to be ſpoken contrary to it ſelfe, as the wordes to be obſcure, but the Senſe moſt cleer; Dauid doubtles well vnderſtood the Hebrew Phraſes, and therefore that could cauſe no difficulty to him.

(1) Pſ. 118. 18.
(2) Ib. ver. 26.
(3) Ib ver. 34.
(4) Præfat. Aſſert. Art. à Leone 10. damnatorum.
(5) Prolog. Cont. Petr. à Soto.

The Apoſtles likewiſe who had heard ſo many heauenly leſſons, giuen from the mouth of Chriſt, were yet ſo troubled with this difficulty of Scriptures, as that our Sauiour accompanying the two diſciples going to Emaus, (6) *Beginning from Moyſes and all the Prophets, he did interpret to them in all the Scriptures the things that were concerning him &c.* And *they ſayd one to the other, Was not our heart burning in vs, whyles he ſpake in the way, and opened vnto vs the Scriptures?* Yea immediatly before his Aſcenſion, all his Apoſtles being aſſembled togeather, he ſayd to them (7) *Theſe are the words which I ſpake to you, when I was yet with you, that all things muſt needs be fulfilled which are written in the Law of Moyſes, and the Prophets, and the Pſalmes of me. Then he opened their vnderſtanding, that they might vnderſtand the Scriptures.* Signifying therby that the Apoſtles themſelues, could not rightly vnderſtand the Scriptures, had not Chriſt ſpecially opened or enlightned their vnderſtandings, that they might vnderſtand the Scriptures. Heere I hope it will not be replyed, that the Apoſtles did not know the Hebrew Phraſes, themſelues being Hebrews borne: nor that they were proud and misbelieuers, being the choſen Apoſtles of Chriſt our Sauiour.

(6) Luc. 24. 27. 32.
(7) Luc. 24. 44. 45.

In

In reſpect of the Scriptures difficulty, as alſo of the weaknes of vs to conceyue; the Apoſtle (8) maketh difference not only of perſons, but of doctrine, affirming ſome to be *vnſkilfull of the word of Iuſtice*, and *ſuch as are to be fed with milke*, or eaſy doctrine: others who by cuſtome haue their ſenſes exerciſed to the diſcerning of good and euill; and of theſe the Apoſtle ſayth, *ſtrong meat is for the perfect*. And ſo elswhere he ſayth, (9) *we ſpeake wiſdome among the perfect*, diſcourſing oftentimes of doctrine hard to be vnderſtood, ſuch as the Apoſtle termeth (10) *inexplicable*. So cleere it is that ſome miſteries and doctrines of faith, are ſo farre from being eaſy, that they are ſo hard that they are *inexplicable*.

(8) *Heb.* 5. 13. 14.

(9) 1. *Cor.* 2. v. 7.

(10) *Heb* 5. 11.

S. Philip hearing the Ethyopian Eunuch (11) reading Eſay the Prophet, ſaid, *Troweſt thou that thou vnderſtandeſt the things which thou readeſt? who ſaid, And how can I vnleſſe ſome man ſhew me? And he deſired Philip that he would come vp, and ſit with him. And the place of the Scripture which he did read was this; As a ſheep to ſlaughter was he led &c. And the Eunuch &c. ſaid, I beſeech thee of whom doth the Prophet ſpeake this? of himſelf, or of ſome other? And Philip opening his mouth, and beginning from this Scripture, Euangelized vnto him Ieſus*. Here the Eunuch acknowledging his ignorance in the vnderſtanding of the Scriptures, intreateth the Apoſtle to expound the ſame, which he accordingly performed, not referring him backe againe to the Scriprures, or any conference therof. Now wheras ſome reply that this Eunuch, as alſo the Apoſtle at thoſe tymes were carnall, & therfore no meruaile if the Scripture were to them as then obſcure: I anſwere, that all hereticks and Infidels, to whom the Proteſtants preſcribe the ſacred Scriptures for their only certaine Rule, direction, and Iudge in matters of fayth, are doubtles no leſſe carnall; yea all ignorant perſons are in like manner carnall, at leaſt before their Conuerſion, and yet in the meane tyme the foreſaid Scriptures muſt be their only ſtay; yea after their Conuerſion, they are ſtill, in regard of their capacity & vnderſtanding, weak, and carnall, though otherwiſe ſpirituall in reſpect of their faith, humility, and obedience.

(11) *Act.* 8. 30. 31.

But none more cleerly teſtifyeth the obſcurity of Scriptures

Scriptures then Saint Peter, who expreſſely writeth thus:
(12) 2 Pet. 3. 15. 16. (12) *As alſo our moſt deare Brother Paul according to the wiſedome giuen him hath written to you. As alſo in all Epiſtles ſpeaking in them of theſe things, in the which are certayne things hard to be vnderſtood, which the vnlearned, and vnſtable deprane, as alſo the reſt of the Scriptures, to their owne perdition.* This text is ſo conuincing, that D. Fulke in his tranſlation thereof, moſt directly contrary to the Greeke and Latin, doth thus fowly corrupt and falſify the ſame, (13) *Yea almoſt in euery Epiſtle ſpeaking of ſuch things, among which are many things to be vnderſtood, which they that are hard, vnlearned, and vnſtable, peruert, as they do alſo the other Scriptures, vnto their owne deſtruction.* This making of *Hardnes* to agree to the Readers, not to the Scriptures, is ſo groſſe a corruption, as that other Proteſtant (14) Tranſlatours reiecting the ſame, do agree with our vulgar tranſlation heerin. And though S. Peter doth not ſay, that S. Pauls Epiſtles are hard, but only that in them are certaine thinges hard to be vnderſtood, which ſome pretend for an anſwere, yet all is one to ſay, ſuch an Authour is hard to be vnderſtood, or he writeth of matters hard to be vnderſtood: And the rather heer, in that S. Peter alledgeth this hardnes, as reaſon why S. Pauls Epiſtles are *depraued by the vnlearned and vnſtable*. And it may iuſtly be further obſerued, that ſeeing S. Peter affirmeth, thoſe things of S. Paul, as alſo the other Scriptures to be depraued by vnlearned, and vnſtable men, therby he ſheweth the other Scriptures for the moſt part to be likewiſe obſcure: for by reaſon of the difficulty, the other Scriptures alſo are depraued, euen as thoſe things of Pauls Epiſtles. All this notwithſtanding, Whitaker bluſheth not to affirme, that Peter doth not ſay, (15) *Pauls Epiſtles to be obſcure, no nor that in Pauls Epiſtles there are certayne things obſcure:* but this the very ſenſe of Seeing will eaſily confute, by but reading the words themſelues.

(11) Againſt the Rhem. Teſt. 2. Pet. 3. 16.

(14) See Bible of Anno 1592.

(15) Controu. 1. q. 4. c. 3. pa. 341.

SECT.

SECT. III.

That the Ancient Fathers expound the ſacred Scriptures agreably with Catholikes, in proofe of the Scriptures obſcurity, and difficulty.

SAint Ambroſe writing vpon the former words of King Dauid, *Giue me vnderſtanding, and I will ſearch thy Law*, ſaith, (1) *The Prophet who had receyued the Holy Ghoſt, after he was annointed King, annoynted a Prophet, writing the hundred and eighteene Pſalme, deſireth vnderſtanding to be giuen to him, that he may vnderſtand the Commandements of God; and knoweth, that vnles he receyue grace from our Lord, he is not able to vnderſtand his Commandements.* S. Hierome alleaging the ſelfe ſame words inferreth thus, (2) *If ſo great a Prophet confeſſeth the darknes of his Ignorance, with what a night of Ignorance doeſt thou thinke vs little ones and almoſt ſucking babes to be compaſſed? But this veyle was not only put vpon the face of Moyſes, but alſo vpon the Euangeliſts and the Apoſtles.* S. Chryſoſtome expounding thoſe words of Chriſt our Sauiour, *Search* (3) *the Scriptures*, ſaith, (4) *Chriſt referreth the Iewes not to the ſimple and naked reading of the Scriptures, but to a very diligent ſearch; he ſaid not, Read the Scriptures, but Search, for diuine things do need greateſt diligence. In a thadow to thoſe Anceſtors not without cauſe he ſpoke, he commanded therefore to dig more deep, that ſo we may fynd thoſe things that lye hid in the bottome. For we do not dig for any thing that lyes in the Superficies, and is apparant, but for that which as a treaſure is hid in the bottome, for he that ſeeketh for ſuch things as thoſe, vnles he vſe greateſt diligence and labour, he ſhall neuer fynd the things ſought for.* S. Hierome inſtanceth this obſcurity in diuers bookes of the Bible, (5) *Who is able* (ſayth he) *to vnderſtand or expound Eſay, Hieremy, Ezechiel, and Daniel. Ezechiel hath a begining and ending inwrapped in ſo great obſcurities, as that theſe parcels with the beginning of Geneſis, were not read by the Hebrues before they were thirty yeares old &c. Iames, Peter, Iohn, Iudas ſet forth ſeauen Epiſtles, ſimplicall as ſuccinct, & both ſhort and long: ſhort in words, but long in*

(1) *Serm. 10. in Pſal. 118.*

(2) *Ep. 13 ad Paulin. c. 4.*

(3) *Io. 5. 39.*

(4) *Hom. 40. in Ioan.*

(5) *Ep. 103. ad Paulinum. ca. 7.*

in Sentences: ſo that he is a rare man, who is not halfe blynd in the reading therof. The Apocalyps of Iohn hath as many myſteries as words.

(6) Præf. in Oſeam.

Againe, (6) *If in the expoſitions of all the Prophets we need the comming of the holy Ghoſt, that by his reuelation they may be opened, by whoſe inſtinct they were written; And we read in Eſay, that the booke was ſealed, which the Scribes and Phariſees, who boaſted they knew the letters of the Law, could not read, becauſe it was ſealed, and none could be found but the lyon of the Tribe of Iuda, whom God the Father ſigned, who was able to open the myſteries therof: How much more in the explanation of the Prophet Oſee is our Lord to be prayed vnto, & with Peter we are to ſay,* (7) *Expound vs this Parable; eſpecially ſince he teſtifieth the obſcurity of this volume in the end therof, who writ it,* (8) *Who is wyſe and ſhall vnderſtand theſe things? Vnderſtanding, and ſhall know theſe things? which we are to vnderſtand, not as impoſſible, but as difficult.* In like ſort concerning the Epiſtle to the Romanes, he auoucheth, that (9) *All the Epiſtle to the Romanes needeth interpretation, and is wrapped in ſo great obſcurities, as that to vnderſtand the ſame, we need the help of the holy Ghoſt, who by the Apoſtle did ſpeake theſe things.*

(7) Mat. 13.

(8) Oſe 14. 10.

(9) Ep 150. ad Hedibiam q. 10.

S. Hierome alſo alledging the former example of the Eunuch mentioned in the Acts, writeth thus, (10) *That in the meane tyme I may ſpeake of my ſelfe, I am neither more holy, nor more ſtudious then this Eunuch, who came from AEthiopia, that is, from the vttermoſt Coaſts of the world, to the Temple, left the Court, and became ſo great a louer of the Law and diuine knowledge, that euen in his Chariot he read the Scriptures: And yet hauing the Bible, thinking of the words of our Lord, with tongue and lippes ſpeaking therof, yet he knew not him, whom vnknowne he worshipped in the Booke: Philip came and showed to him Ieſus, who shut vp lay hid in the letter. O wonderfull vertue of the Teacher! The ſame houre the Eunuch beleueth, is baptized, and is made faithfull and holy, and of a ſcholler becometh a Maiſter &c. theſe things I haue briefly touched &c. that thou shouldeſt vnderſtand, that in the ſacred Scriptures, thou art not able to enter the narrow path without a guide and a teacher.* And then ſhewing that neither *Grammarians, Rhetoricians, Philoſophers, Geometricians, Logicians, Muſicians, Aſtronomers, Aſtrologers, Phyſitians, no nor Husband men, Carpenters, Smithes &c.* can come to be that which they deſire, without a

(10) Ep. 101. ad Paulinum.

teacher

teacher &c. he addeth, as alſo our tymes do plainly confirme, that *it is only the Art of Scriptures, which all do challenge to themſelues &c. This the chatling old wife, this the foolish old man, this the prating Sophiſter, this all preſume, teare, and teach. before they learne.*

S. Auſtine endeauouring to expound theſe wordes of S. Paul, (11) *If any man build vpon this foundation, gould, ſiluer, precious ſtones &c.* promiſeth that (12) *it is meet diligently to attend how that ſentence of Paul the Apoſtle is to be taken, being plainly difficult to be vnderſtood.* Yea he further teacheth, that this *Sentence is to be accounted amongſt thoſe whereof Peter affirmeth, that in the writings (of Paul) there are certaine things hard to be vnderſtood.* And comming to ſet downe his owne opinion he ſayth (13) *Heer peraduenture it wilbe expected of me, what I thinke of this Sentence of Paul the Apoſtle, and how I thinke it is to be vnderſtood? Heer I confeſſe I had rather heare others more vnderſtanding, and more learned &c.* So cleerly doth S. Auſtine acknowledge the difficulty of Scriptures, exemplifying the ſame particularly in S. Pauls writings, which he taketh to be of thoſe which S. Peter meant, when he affirmed, that there were certaine things hard to be vnderſtood in the Epiſtles of Paul. And thus we ſee that the auncient Fathers do cleerly expound the Scriptures agreably with Catholikes, in proofe of their obſcurity and difficulty.

(11) Cor. 3 12.
(12) De fide & operibus. c. 15.
(13) Ib. c. 16.

SECT. IV.

That Proteſtants expound the Sacred Scriptures agreably with Catholikes in proofe of the Scriptures obſcurity: And that ſundry Proteſtants do teach and defend the ſame Doctrine.

CHemnitius producing the former example of the Eunuch, teacheth that in reſpect (1) *of many hard queſtions, God would haue to remayne in his Church, to auoyd all occaſion of errour, the guift of interpretatation, which is not common to all, no more then is the guift of healing and miracles. And this guift God*

(1) Exam. part. 1. f. 63.

would not haue contemned or reiected, but reuerently vſed as an Inſtrument and help, to fynd out the true and ſound ſenſe of Scriptures, euen as the Eunuch ſaid, How can I vnderſtand without a Guide?

The Tranſlatours of the Engliſh Bible of Anno 1578. in their marginall notes, of the place before alleadged from S. Peter (2. Pet. 3. 16.) do affirme that; *As no man condemneth the brightnes of the ſunne, becauſe his eye is not able to ſuſtayne the cleernes therof; So the hardnes which we cannot ſometyme compaſſe, or perfectly vnderſtand in the Scriptures, ought not to take from vs the vſe of the Scriptures.*

(1) Loc. com. loc. 33 f. 104. Aretius affirmeth that (2) *Many thinges remayne obſcure euen to the Godly &c. Who did euer ſufficiently expreſſe the matter of the Trinity, of the Incarnation of the ſonne of God &c. I paſſe ouer in ſilence the different vnderſtandings of the places of the Ghoſpell, wherin thou mayeſt fynd among the Interpreters, almoſt ſo many opinions, as there be Interpreters.* And immediatly after, he alledgeth the foreſaid ſaying of S. Peter, to proue the obſcurity of S. Paules Epiſtles; affirming generally of the Scriptures, that

(1) Ib id. fol. 105. they contayne (3) *obſcurity, as well in the matter as in the phraſe.* And that *the veyle* (or darknes) *of the letter, is taken away by fit Interpreters. And that thoſe being wanting, the Church is brought in-*

(4) De ſacra. Script. p. 46. *to darknes.* The like wherof is alſo taught by (4) D. Whitaker. D. Fulke not only produceth ſeuerall of the forealledged textes agreably to this purpoſe, but alſo declareth his

(5) Againſt Rhem. Teſt. in 2. Pet. 3. p. 811. owne opinion to be the ſame, ſaying: (5) *As concerning the Argument and matter of the Scriptures, we confeſſe that for the moſt and chiefeſt matters, it is not only hard, but impoſſible to be vnderſtood of the naturall man &c.* Againe, *Hierome to Paulinus noteth certaine difficult places in the Prophets; and who will miſlike him that he deſired to learne of Didimus? &c. And Dauid prayed for vnderſtanding. The Eunuch required an Interpreter. And we alſo affirme that prayer is neceſſary for all men, and an Interpreter requiſite for the vnlearned, that will come to the right vnderſtanding of the Scripture &c. Yea we deny not but the Scriptures are in ſome places*

(6) Ib. p. 810. *very hard.* And (6) *we plainly proteſt, that whoſoeuer deſpiſeth the ordinary Miniſtery of the word, which God hath eſtablished in his Church, for the direction of vs in truth and loue, ſhall neuer attayne to true knowledge, no, though he were otherwiſe neuer ſo well learned,*

much

much leſſe if he be ignorant and vnlearned.

Cartwright the Puritane auoucheth, that (7) *Vnles the Lord worke miraculouſly and extraordinarily, the bare reading of the Scriptures without preaching cannot deliuer ſo much as one poore sheep from deſtruction.* But would any man thinke it credible, that ſo learned a man as D. Martin Luther, ſhould ſo ingenuouſly confeſſe his owne ignorance in the vnderſtanding of any one Booke of Scripture? obſerue but his words: *I would* (8) *not haue that to be preſumed by any of me, which none yet of the moſt holy and moſt learned could performe, to wit, to vnderſtand and teach the true ſenſe of the Pſalter in all thinges. It is inough to haue vnderſtood ſome, and thoſe in part, the holy Ghoſt hath reſerued many things to himſelfe, that he might alwayes haue vs his ſchollers. And I know it to be a point of moſt impudent rashnes of him that dare profeſſe, that he vnderſtandeth anyone booke of Scripture, in all parts.* (9) *Aboue twenty yeares agoe I was compelled to contemne the Commentaries of the Fathers, when I was to read the Scriptures in the ſchooles, and with great ſweat* (or paines) *to ſeeke the true and proper meaning.*

(7) In Whiteg. Def. p. 784.

(8) *Prof. in Pſalmos.*

(9) *De Concil. p. 22.*

The Tranſlatour of the Engliſh Bible of Anno 1600. auoucheth, that it is, (10) *A very hard thing to vnderſtand the holy Scriptures, and that diuers errors, ſects, and hereſies grow dayly, for lacke of the true knowledge therof.* The Centuriſts doubt not to affirme that, (11) *The very Apoſtles thought that the Scriptures cannot be vnderſtood, without the holy Ghoſt, and an Interpreter.* Caluin ſpeaking of the Scripture ſayth, (12) *Daily reading, we fall into many obſcure places, which do argue vs of Ignorance. But with this bridle God keepeth vs in humility, aſſigning to euery one a meaſure of faith, that euen the beſt Doctour may be ready to learne.* So cleerly do the learneſt Proteſtants expound the ſacred Scriptures, in proofe of the Scriptures obſcurity, and conſequently agreably with Catholiks defend the ſame Doctrine.

(10) Preface.

(11) *Cent. 1. l. 2. c. 4. col. 32.*

(12) *Inſtit. l. 3. c. 2. §. 4.* See l. 4. c. 17. §. 10.

SECT. V.

That the Scriptures are obscure, it is further proued by sundry reasons.

IN Scriptures we may consider, either the things there spoken of, or the manner wherwith they are spoken, both which are obscure: for the matter therin contayned, it is concerning the blessed Trinity, the Incarnation of Christ, the Sacraments, the hidden working of God in the soule of man, sundry Prophecyes not to be accomplished so many hundred yeares after their first prediction, and other the like. All which being high Misteries, must of necessity be difficult.

Now the manner wherwith they are set downe is no lesse obscure, for first many things seeme to be contrary, (1) *23, I am the Lord thy God &c. visiting the iniquity of the Fathers vpon the Children.* And the (2) *Soule that shall sinne, the same shall dye: the sonne shall not beare the Iniquity of the Father.* S. Matthew and S. Luke report, (3) *that our Sauiour sending his Apostles to preach, forbad them to take a Rod.* But S. Marke recordeth that, (4) *he commanded them that they should take nothing for the way, but a Rod only.* S. Paul affirmeth that, (5) *In the Arke of the Testament, there was a goulden pot hauing Manna, and the Rod of Aaron that had blossomed, and the Tables of the Testament.* And yet in the third Booke of kings, and elswhere it is said, (6) *In the Arke there was nothing but two Tables of stone.* Againe in the Acts of the Apostles it is said, (7) *The men that went in company with (Paul) stood amazed, hearing the voyce, but seeing no man.* And yet in the same Acts, S. Paul sayth, (8) *They that went with me, saw the light indeed, but the voice they heard not of him that spake with me.* So likewise in S. Luke, Christ said to Peter, (9) *The Cocke shall not crow to day till thou deny thrice that thou knowest me.* And yet S. Marke relateth that, (10) *After the first deniall the Cocke crew, and that after another deniall, immediatly the Cocke crew againe*, all which, with many (11) other such like, are seeming Contrarieties. Which must needs argue greatest diffi-

(1) Exod. 20. 5.
(2) Ezech. 18. 20.
(3) Mat. 10. 10. Luc. 9. 3.
(4) Mark. 6. 8.
(5) Heb. 9. 4.
(6) C. 8 9. 2. Paralip. 5. 10.
(7) C. 9 7.
(8) C. 22. 10.
(9) C. 22. 34.
(10) C. 14. 68. 72.
(11) See Mar. 15. 25. & Io. 19. 44. Also Luc. 3. 35. 36. & Gen. 11 12. See also Hook. l. 5. sec. 19. p. 30.

difficulty for their right vnderſtanding, ſeeing, that we are bound to belieue, that they are not truly contrary, but all true in themſelues.

In like ſort there are many ſpeaches ſo obſcure & doubtfull, as that the learnedſt Interpreters do vary and are troubled therwith. When the Iewes ſaid, (*) *Who art thou? Ieſus ſaid to them: The beginning who alſo ſpeake to you*: here *Beginning* in Latin (*Principium*) is of the newter gender, and the Relatiue *which* (*qui*) of the Maſculine: And which is more, in Greeke τὴν ἀρχὴν, *Beginning*, is the Accuſatiue caſe, both which according to our ordinary conceipt, would ſeeme a moſt manifeſt incongruity. (*) Io. 8. 25.

There are alſo in the ſacred Scriptures obſcure figures and parables almoſt innumerable. And if we be to examine and determine Controuerſies by the Originalls, we ſhall fynd the Ambiguity, of the Hebrew eſpecially, moſt intricate, one and the ſame word or Phraſe being oftentymes indifferent to receiue diuers ſignifications, whereof great incertainty groweth among the learned, and to the ignorant in tongues, a difficulty inuincible.

And if (as Luther affirmeth) (11) *the Scriptures be more cleer then the Commentaries of all the Fathers*, and as other Prot. make ſo eaſy, that the vulgar people may vnderſtand them by their owne reading, to what end then the Fathers not only heertofore, but euen Proteſtants now continually do write ſo many Commentaries in explanation thereof? But chiefly ſeeing Prot. decyde all Controuerſies only by Scripture, how aryſe ſo daily and deadly diſſentions among themſelues, concerning things taught and ſet downe in the Scriptures, if the Scriptures be ſo eaſy as is pretended? (11) *Praef. aſſert. Artic. à Leone damnatorum.*

To theſe demands two things are vſually anſwered; firſt, that though the Scripture be moſt cleer, yet it is darke to the proud and vnbelieuing, by reaſon of their blindnes, and wicked affection. Secondly, that though in ſome places it be obſcure, yet the ſelfeſame thing is cleerly ſet down in other places. But by the firſt it followeth, that Luther himſelfe (who giueth theſe reaſons) is a Proud man and Infidel, it being euident, and for ſuch euen by Prot. acknow-

ledged, that he taught and maintayned ſundry groſſe errors, and in all for his defence pretending Scriptures. And by the like reaſon the ſame crymes of Pride and Infidelity incurre all Lutherans, by the iudgement of Caluiniſts, and all Caluiniſts by the iudgement of Lutherans; & ſo the like may be affirmed of our Proteſtants and Puritans, euery one of theſe condēning the other of falſe doctrine in ſundry points, and yet all building their opinions vpon the Scriptures.

And againſt the ſecond I vrge firſt, that ſundry obſcure places, haue not coherence with any other place; as the greateſt part of the Apocalyps, and the beginning and end of the Prophet Ezechiel. Secondly though it were true, yet a true conference of places amongſt themſelues, is a thing of it ſelfe very difficult; for that place which a Caluiniſt would thinke to be cleere, and therefore other places concerning the ſame matter to be expounded thereby; a Lutheran will auouch to be obſcure, and other places to be more plaine. Beſides this, it is alſo very difficult alwayes truly to diſcerne whether the places ſo conferred do ſpeake of one and the ſame thing, ſeeing the ſame word, and almoſt the ſame phraze is vſed in Scriptures to ſignify diuers things, as the Scripture (13) it ſelfe teſtifyeth, and S. Auſtine (14) obſerueth. But becauſe this conference of Scripture is accounted by Proteſtants ſo auaylable for the making of Scriptures eaſie to be vnderſtood, and to be our Iudge of Controuerſies; I will therfore treat therof more largely in this Section following.

(11) Baptiſme is ſometimes vſed for the Sacrament of Baptiſme, othertimes for Pennance or Martyrdome. See Mar. 1. 4. 1. Cor. 15. 29. & Mar. 10. 38. Luc. 12. 50.

(14) L. 2. de Doctr. Chriſti, c. 24 25. 26.

SECT. VI.

That the Conference of one place of Scripture with another, doth neither make the Scriptures to be our Iudge of all Controuerſies, nor alwayes eaſy to be vnderſtood.

(1) Reinolds in his Conference. pa. 68.

(2) *De ſacra Script. p. 522.*

SEeing Proteſtants generally teach, that (1) *It is not the ſhew, but the ſenſe of the words that muſt decyde Controuerſies:* And ſeeing as D. Whitaker auoucheth, (2) *The Scripture hath no liuely*

liuely voyce which we may heare we muſt vſe certayne meanes whereby we may ſearch out what is the true ſenſe & meaning of the Scriptures. And theſe meanes, as they (3) preſcribe, are our *reading of the Scriptures, our Conference of places, our waighing of the Circumſtances of the text, our skill in the tongues, our diligence, our Prayer and ſuch like.* Of which meanes D. Reynolds doubted not to auerre, that, (4) *They are ſtill effectuall, if men pray as they ſhould, and ſearch as they ought in the ſpirit of fayth and modeſty.* And D. Fulke auoucheth that, (5) *Who ſo obſerueth this ſearch ſhall come to the knowledge of the truth moſt certainly.*

I will now make manifeſt the vanity and inſufficiency of this pretended courſe of tryall, and that for ſundry reſpects: for firſt if in the obſeruation of the foreſayd meanes, they require ſuch a conference and diligence as is but imaginary, and cannot be performed; then they preſcribe vainly and to no purpoſe: And if they intend but ſuch a diligent obſeruation as is poſſible and within our power; then I alledge them the example (to omit others) of D. Martin Luther, whome Prot. acknowledge to be a man (6) *ſent of God to lighten the world,* (7) *the Elias, Conductour, and Chariot of Iſrael,* whoſe *calling they thinke* (8) *extraordinary*, and his comming and ſpeaking ſpecially (9) *foreſhewed in the Scriptures*, & ſince foretould by (10) *ſundry Prophecyes* (of later tymes) *which went vpon the tyme of Martin Luther*: yea they accompt him a (11) *Prophet, and that ſundry of his Prophecies proued true*: And himſelfe vndertooke that he was ſo aſſured and certayne of the truth of his doctrine, as he feared not to ſay; (12) *I would haue you know, that hereafter I will not honour you ſo much, that I will eyther ſuffer you, or the Angells from heauen to iudge of my doctrine &c. Neyther will I haue my doctrine iudged by any, and therefore not of the very Angels: for ſeeing I am certaine thereof, I will thereby be Iudge both of you and the Angells.* This is the pure ſpirit of a new Goſpeller.

Now this ſo rare a man, being skillfull (13) in the Gereeke and Hebrew did not only conferre the Scriptures moſt diligently, euen with a deſire (as himſelfe confeſſeth) to alter his Iudgement agaynſt the Real Preſence, (14) *Becauſe* (ſayth he) *I did well perceyue that I might very greatly hurt thereby*

(3) Rein in his Conf. p. 83. 84. 92. 99 Whitak. de ſacra Scrip. p. 512. 522 523.
(4) Conference. pa. 09.
(5) Againſt Purgat. p. 434.
(6) *Apolog. Angl. part. 4. c. 4. q. 2.*
(7) *Act. Mon. p. 416.*
(8) *Aret. loc. com. loc. 63 p. 198. Dureus Iſagog. part. 4. in 2. p. 36. Laſcius de Ruſ. Religione p. 93.*
(9) *Anti-Chriſtus p. 22. 23. 80. Conradus Schluſſelb. in Catal. hæret. p. 314. 316.*
(10) Act. Mon. p. 399. & ſee Fox in Apoc. p. 324.
(11) Sleidan. l. 16. & after the Eng. Tranſl. fol. 222.
(12) *Aduerſus*

thereby the Papacy (ſo direct and holy was his intention:) and, *If Carolostadius or any man els could haue perſuaded* (him) *that there had been nothing in the Sacrament but Bread and Wyne, he ſhould haue bound him to him by a great good turne.* But alſo he had perſonall (15) *Communication* therein with Oecolampadius and Swinglius, he heard and obſerued their conference and Collections from the Scriptures: and yet all this notwithſtanding ſtill perſiſted in his former opinion (16) of *the Real Preſence:* the which he thought to be ſo cleere a truth, that mentioning his former deſire to change his Iudgment therein; he yet concludeth and ſayth, (17) *But I do ſee my ſelfe captiue, no way being left to eſcape; for the Text of the Goſpell is too playne &c.* And not content with this, he proceedeth ſo farre, as to (18) *ſet forth a booke againſt Swinglius*, wherin he reciteth and (19) reiecteth the arguments and conferences of Scripture framed by Swinglius and Oecolampadius againſt the *Real Preſence*.

ſus falsò nominatum Eccleſiaſticum Statum.

(11) *Act. Mon p.* 403.

(14) Ep. ad Argentinenſ. And in the Treatiſe againſt the Defence of the Cenſure p. 99. 100.

(15) Coopers Chronicle fol. 290. Sleydan l. 6. f. 83.

(16) See Bridges in his defence of the Gouern. pag. 559. Perkins in his 4. Treatiſes Tract. How to apply Gods word. num. 10.

(17) Ep ad Argentinenſ. and the Treatiſe againſt the Defence of the Cenſure. p. 100.

Now vpon theſe premiſes I do inferre, that for ſo much as Luther obſerued the foreſayd preſcribed meanes of conferring the Scriptures, and that with all diligence he could, and yet the ſame notwithſtanding, ſtill belieued and taught (in other Proteſtants Iudgements) a doctrine moſt erroneous, as alſo the like did his followers (20) Chemnitius, Iacobus (21) Andreas, and (22) others of the learnedſt Proteſtants; that therefore the Conference of Scriptures, though obſerued & vſed with all diligence we can, is yet neuertheleſſe vncertaine, and vnauoydable to reſolue vs priuatly, much more to end and determine our publicke Controuerſies.

Secondly, I argue from the nature of the thing it ſelfe, that ſeeing our foreſayd skill in tongues, our conference of places, and other preſcribed meanes, are but actions on our behalfe humane, and ſuch wherein, as in our other humane endea-

(18) Sleydan. l. 16. f. 215. after the Eng. Tranſlat. (19) Defenſ. verborum Cœnæ in the 7. Tome of Luthers workes. (20) *Exam. part.* 2. 92. 94. 100. (21) *In Confut. Diſput. Grinæi de cœna Domini.* (22) *Act. Eccl. ſep. de* 8 *cœna publicè in Academia Heidelberg. Anno* 1584. and ſee *Heſſenreff loc. Theol. l.* 3. *loc.* 7. *de Sacram. p.* 371.

endeauours, euery man without extraordinary Priuiledge from God, is (all his prayer, learning, and possible diligence notwithstanding) subiect to error, ouerſight, and mans infirmity, as both reason and Experience teach; that therfore the same can be no certaine and infallible Course of Iudgment, whereby to determine Controuersies. A truth so certayne, that Lubbertus speaking of their owne learnedst ministers and Interpreters sayth, (23) *as we haue showed that all these may erre in expounding, so also do we affirme, that they may erre in Iudging.* Yea sayth Zanchius, (24) *with Iudgment let vs heare them, knowing that they are men, and that they could, and may erre.* And as it were despairing to prescribe any Rule for meanes, he iumpeth from them to the point of Elections, so restrayning the vnderstanding of Scriptures, as an immediate and speciall guift peculiar only to the Elect, (25) *chiefly by reason of this obscurity* (sayth he) *we can giue no rule for the vnderstanding of Scriptures, because it is in no mans power, that be be Elect.* And, *It is only graunted to the Elect, that they may vnderstand the sacred Scriptures truly, clearly, properly, and soundly.*

(23) *De principijs Christian. dogm. p. 563.*
(24) *De sacra Scripts. pag. 411. 412.*
(25) *Ib. pag. 375.*

D. Whitaker, who prescribed the foresaid meanes, is enforced yet to giue sentence against them, and therin against himselfe, saying, (26) *Such as the meanes are, such of necessity must the Interpretation be: but the meanes of Interpreting are obscure, vncertayne, doubtfull, and ambiguous, therfore it cannot be, but that the Interpretation also must be vncertaine. If vncertaine, then may it also be false &c.* So that all diligence in Conferring is insufficient to assure vs infallibly of the true sense of the Scriptures.

(26) *De Ecclesia Controu. 2. q. 4. p. 221.*

Thirdly such as are ignorant in the tongues, wherin Scripture was first written, as also such as cannot read at all, cannot haue the foresaid Conference for their Infallible Iudge, seeing whether the Translatours haue erred, either vpon Ignorance or malice, or both, they are not able to discerne; and consequently whether that which they read or heare, be altogether true Scripture, or rather repleni∫hed with manifold errors, and so no certaine Iudge, they remaine most vncertaine. According to which D. Whitaker is enforced to confesse, that, (27) *The Ignorance of the Hebrew*

(27) *De sacra Script. pag. 523.*

and Greeke tongues, hath brought forth many Errors: truly thoſe that know them not, do erre often and vnauoydably. And therfore for the inſtruction of theſe he is enforced to fly to their immediate knowledge from the holy Ghoſt, ſaying, (28) *The Ignorant in tongues, although they cannot Iudge of all places whether they be truly tranſlated, yet they acknowledge and allow the Doctrine being inſtructed by the holy Ghoſt.* And as for thoſe others, (29) *Who know not letters, and cannot read,* he granteth that, *They retayne wholſome faith by the preaching of their Paſtors.* So that to all ſuch as do not vnderſtand the Hebrew, and the Greeke, or that cannot read at all, the foreſaid Conference of Scripture can be no immediate and certaine courſe of Iudgment.

(28) Ib. pag. 127.

(29) Ib. p. 588.

Fourthly, this foreſaid Conference is only a Colourable refuge of words, wherby to make, not the Scripture our Iudge, but our ſelues Iudge of the Scripture: for to Conferre and apply the Scriptures, and therby to determine the right ſenſe, is in vs an acte of our vnderſtanding, euen as it is the like to confer our temporall lawes: wherfore if the Scripture only without our conference therof, do not determine to vs the true meaning of it ſelfe, then is it no more our Iudge in Matters of faith, then the law is in temporall cauſes: And then further, if euery one of vs be to vndertake this Conference for himſelfe, without relying vpon the Conference and Iudgment of any Interpreter, further then we our ſelues can diſcerne the ſame to be true by our Conference, (as many Proteſtants (30) teach) it therof neceſſarily followeth, that euery man muſt iudge and determine the ſenſe of the Scriptures for himſelfe, which is all one as to make himſelfe his owne iudge. A cleere Example hereof Proteſtants haue in their Lutheran and Puritane Brethren, of whom they muſt needs confeſſe, that concerning ſuch Errors as they lay to their charge, they make themſelues Iudges of the Scripture, and not the Scripture their Iudge.

(30) Zanchius de ſacra Script. p. 412. Whitak. de ſacra Script. pag. 519 Carth. wr. in Whiteg. def. pag. 111. & Whitguift 16. Billon in his differẽce &c. part 2. p. 313. Willet Synopſ. Controu. 1. q 2 p. 127.

Neither doth it ſuffice to anſwere, that they defend not an erroneous, but a ſincere Conference: for the rightfull conference maketh the Scripture no more Iudge, then doth the right conference of the lawes, make the Law to be our Iudge. And as for the different kinds of erroneous and rightfull

rightfull Conference, they do equally and alike admit our Iudgment and act of conferring, only the nature of this conference is seuerally altered, according to the sincerity or errour therof. So that as Protestants must needs confesse of their foresaid Brethren, that they in their said Erroneous conference make not the Scripture their Iudge, but themselues Iudges, though erroneous Iudges of the Scriptures meaning: In like manner in their owne Conference, they make themselues (though in their opinion rightly Iudges, yet) Iudges and determiners therof. Wherupon it followeth, that Protestants whether learned or vnlearned, conferring the Scriptures either sincerely or erroneously, do neuertheles in the said Conferences make themselues Iudges of the Scripture, and not the Scripture their Iudge.

This sequele is so cleere, that sundry Prot. do in plaine termes acknowledge the same. Lubbertus teacheth, (31) *All the faythfull are Iudges of interpretations and doctrines.* And (32) *that God hath giuen to euery faythfull person, not only the Spirit of vnderstanding but also of discerning false doctrine from true.* D. Bilson expressely defendeth, that, (33) *The people must be discerners & Iudges of that which is taught.* Brentius auoucheth most fully that, (34) *It appertayneth to euery priuat man to iudge of doctrine concerning Religion, and to discerne true doctrine from false.* So that now any Cobler may be a competent Iudge of the true sense of the Scriptures, or of any doctrine preached by his Pastour.

(31) *De Princip. Christ. dogm. l. 13. p. 363.*
(32) *Ibid. p. 373.*
(33) *True difference &c. part. 2. p. 353.*
(34) *In Prologom. Cons. Sotum & in Confes. Wittemberg c. de sacra Script.*

But what seriously doth ensue of all this, but that euery heretike and ignorant fellow, may at his pleasure, exept himselfe from all authority of Scriptures, Councels, Fathers, Pastours, and the Church it selfe, making his owne fancy and conceypt, the supremest Iudge of all. Whereby amōgst other absurdities, it euer happeneth, that as yet could neuer be established any agreement in Religion amongst the Protestant faction: but rather to the contrary, the schisme and diuision so long continued between Lutherans, Swinglians, Caluinists, Anabaptists, Brownists, Puritanes &c. heerby to be most strongly vphoulden and maintayned, & that which is most dangerous, without all hope and proba-

bility of any future vnity and conſent. Wherefore I may cõclude, that our Moderne Proteſtants creating for their Iudg their our Conference of Scripture, do thereby only endeauour, as S. Auſtine affirmeth of all heretickes, that (35) *Euery mans mind may be his owne guide, and, that he be not ſubiect to the authority of Scriptures, but that, he may make ſubiect the authority of Scriptures to himſelfe.*

(35) L. 32. cont. Faust. c. 19.

Adde only heerunto what M. Hooker thinketh of this cyting & cõferring of Scriptures: (36) *Such are readieſt (ſayth he) to cyte for one thing fyue hundred ſentences of holy Scripture, what warrãt haue they, that any one of them doth meane the thing, for which it is alledged? Is not their ſureſt ground moſt commonly, either ſome probable coniecture of their owne, or the Iudgment of others, taking thoſe Scriptures as they do? which notwithſtanding to meane otherwiſe then they take them, it is not ſtill altogether impoſſible. So that now and then they ground themſelues on humane authority, euen when they moſt pretend diuine.* So fallible ſtill is this Conference of Scriptures.

(36) Eccl pol. l. 2. Sect. 7. fol. 118.

But I will conclude with D. Fields Iudgment in this Caſe. (37) *We confeſſe (ſayth he) that neither conference of places, nor conſideration of things precedent and ſubſequent, nor looking into the originall, are of any force, vnles we find the thing which we conceiue to be vnderſtood and meant, in the places interpreted, to be conſonant to the Rule of faith.* And this Rule of faith (he teacheth) must be tryed, (38) *either by the generall practiſe of the Church, the renowned of all ages, or the Paſtors of an apoſtolicall Church.* So vnable is this pretended Conference to make a competent Iudge.

(37) L. 4. c. 12.

(38) Ibid.

I muſt needs yet obſerue how aduenturous Proteſtants are for the maintaining the honour of their ſupreme Iudge the Conference of Scriptures. For whereas it is ſayd, that S. Paul (39) *Entring into the Synagogue, he preached Ieſus &c. and all that heard, were aſtonyed &c. But Saul waxed mighty much more, and confounded the Iewes that dwelt at Damaſcus, affirming that this is Chriſt*, Proteſtants tranſlate thoſe laſt words thus; (40) *Saul confounded them, proouing (by conferring one Scripture with another) that this is very Chriſt.* Here for *affirming*, they ſay, *proouing*, but this not ſatisfying inough, they add to the text it ſelfe theſe words,

(39) Act. 9. 20. 21. 22.

(40) See the Engliſh Church Bible of Anno 1577.

words, *By conferring one Scripture with another*, which words are not to be found in any Originall. And though some other Bibles haue left out this impious addition in the Text, yet in their marginall (41) notes they are pleased to say, *Proouing by the conference of the Scriptures*: whereas in the place cited, there is not the least mention or inimation of any Scriptures, but directly otherwise it is said, that *he preached in the Synagogues, and confounded the Iewes*. If a Catholicke should add but one word to the text, presently all the woes threatned in Scripture against such Adders, would be thundred against him.

(41) The Engl. great Bible of 1578.

SECT. VII.

An Examination of such Obiections as are vsually vrged by Protestants against the Scriptures obscurity.

MOst (1) Protestant writers obiect those words in Deutronomy, (2) *This Commandement that I command thee this day, is not aboue thee, nor so far of, situated in heauen, that thou mayest say, which of vs is able to ascend vnto heauen to bring it to vs, that we may heare and fulfill it in the worke?* &c. *But the word is very neare thee in thy mouth, and in thy heart to do it.* Answer. 1. Whereas the question is, whether the Scriptures be easy to be vnderstood, here is not any mention made of the Scriptures at all. 2. The words obiected do only proue, and that directly against Protestants, who teach that the Commandements are impossible to be kept, that indeed the Commandements may be easily performed. And in this sense, is this place vnderstood by Ancient (3) Fathers. 3. It may be vndestood with (4) others of the facility in knowing, not the Scriptures, which as then peraduenture were none, but the Precepts only of the Decalogue, which being naturall, are easily vnderstood, & especially by those Iewes, who had heard Moyses explicate the same: so that according to either sense, the Obiection is impertinent.

(1) Brentius in Prolegom. Cont. Petr. Sotum. (2) C. 30. 11. 12. 14. (3) Tertul. l. 4. cont. Marcion. Orig. Ambros. & Chrysost. in c. 10. ad Rom. Aug. l. de Perfectione Iustitiæ Resp. penult. (4) Abulensis in hunc locum.

Secondly are obiected these wordes of K. Dauid, (5) *Thy word is a lampe to my feete, and a light to my pathes*. And those

(5) Ps. 118. 105.

of S. Peter, (6) *And we haue the prophetical all word more ſure: which you do well attending vnto, as to a candle shyning in a darke place &c.* Anſwere. 1. Neyther of theſe places do ſpeake of all the Scriptures, and therefore they cannot conclude that all the Scriptures are eaſy. Secõdly though they were ſpoken of all the Scriptures, yet the Scriptures may be well called a *Lampe, light*, or *Candle*, not that they be all eaſy to be vnderſtood, but becauſe being once rightly vnderſtood, they do illuſtrate the vnderſtanding, and direct it in the working of good. And ſo K. Dauid in the place obiected, intended to ſhew, that greater was the knowledge which was gotten by the word of God reueiled, then by his Creatures, and therefore he compareth the word of God to a *lampe*, which more auayleth vs for expelling the darknes of the night, then the light of all the ſtarres. Thirdly though the Scriptures be as a *Lanterne* of themſelues, yet we muſt conſider withall how they do, as the Propet ſayth, *enlighten our eyes*: for what if a Candle be put vnder a Buſhell? truly it will as then shyne and burne, but it will not giue light to the ſtanders by, except the buſhell be remoued. Euen ſo, if the light of holy Scripture, shalbe placed vpon the authority of Gods Church, it will illuminate the whole houſe, but if it be cõprehended within the limits of euery priuat mans wit & induſtry, as vnder a bushell, though it remayne in it ſelfe euercleere, yet to the Readers it ſhalbe as extinguiſhed.

(6) 2. Pet. 1. 19.

Thirdly, it is vrged, that in the Prophet Iſay it is ſaid, that, (7) *The booke was ſealed*: And in the Apocalyps we read that, (8) *The Lambe opened the booke*, therfore though in the old Teſtament the booke of Scripture was ſealed or obſcure, yet now in the new, it is opened and eaſy. In ſigne wherof at the Death of Chriſt, (9) *The veyle of the Temple was rent in two peeces*. Anſwere. 1. The wordes of Iſay are, *The viſion of all shalbe vnto you as the words of a booke ſealed; which when they shall giue to him that knoweth letters, they shall ſay, Read this: & he shall anſwere, I cannot, for it is ſealed. And the booke shalibe giuen to one that knoweth no letters &c. And he shall Anſwere, I know not letters.* Heere the words do only import, that the viſion thould be obſcure, as a book ſealed, which neither the learned nor vn-

(7) Iſa. 29. 11. 12.
(8) C. 5. 8. 9.
(9) Mat. 27. 51.

learned

learned could vnderſtād: whereas the Scriptures of the old Teſtamēt were vnderſtood and expounded, by Moyſes, Eſdras, the Prieſts, & the Prophets. Secōdly the difference of the old Teſtament from the new, conſiſteth in this, that the myſteries of Chriſt were not then vnderſtood, and therefore the Booke was layd to be ſealed, as well to the learned as vnlearned, whereas now in the new, Chriſt hauing fulfilled the figures and Prophecies, though many do not vnderſtād the Sentences of Scripture, yet yong Children and ignorant women, do know the myſteries of our Redemption. And that in regard of the Sentences of Scripture, the booke is ſtill ſealed, euen now during the tyme of the new Teſtament, learned Origen teſtifyeth in theſe words: (10) *Let vs ſee if not only when Moyſes is read, but alſo when Paul is read, the veyle be put ouer our hearts. And it is cleer, that if we heare negligently, if we do not adde ſtudy to learning & vnderſtanding; not only the Scriptures of the Law and Prophets, but of the Apoſtles and Ghoſpells are couered to vs with a great veyle &c. From whence it appeareth that we are not only to ſtudy for the learning of the Sacred Scriptures, but we are alſo to pray to our Lord, and day and night to intreat, that the Lambe will come from the Tribe of Iuda, and taking the ſealed booke, will vouchſafe to open it: for he it is who opening the Scriptures, inflameth the hearts of the Diſciples, in ſo much that they ſay,* (11) *Was not our heart burning within vs, when he opened vnto vs the Scriptures?* With Origen agreeth S. Hierome, teaching that, (12) *This veyle is not only put vpon the face of Moyſes* (or the old Teſtament) *but alſo vpon the Euangeliſts and Apoſtles. Our Sauiour ſpake to the people in Parables, and witneſſing that it was myſticall which he ſpoke, he ſayd, He that hath eares to heare, let him heare. Vnles all things which are written be opened by him, who hath the key of Dauid,* (13) *who openeth, and no man ſhutteth, who ſhutteth, and no man openeth, they cannot be opened by any other*: So cleer it is, that euen now during the tyme of the new Teſtament, the Scriptures remayne obſcure, without ſome ſpeciall light & help from Chriſt, and our owne paines, ſtudy and prayer.

(10. Hom. 13. in Exod.

(11) 24. 32.

(12) Ep. 13. ad Paulin. de inſtitu. Monach. c.

(13) Apoc. 3. 7.

Fourthly, ſome obiect theſe words of S. Paul: (14) *And if our Ghoſpell be alſo hid, in them that periſh it is hid, in whome the God of this world hath blynded the mynds of the Infidels, that the illumina-*

(14) 2. Cor. 4. 3. 4.

lumination of the Ghoſpell of the Glory of Chriſt &c. might not ſhine to them: Wherfore to the faithfull the Scriptures are eaſy. Anſw. 1. The Apoſtle ſpeaketh not here of the vnderſtanding of the Scriptures, neither is there any mention made of Scriptures, but of the knowledge and faith in Chriſt, which the Apoſtles preached. And ſo in the very next words following S. Paul ſayth; *For we preach not our ſelues, but Ieſus Chriſt our Lord*: Now no man doubted, but that the Apoſtles preaching was eaſy to be vnderſtood. Secondly in the former Chapter S. Paul declareth this to be the difference betweene the Old and New Teſtament, that in the Old (as I noted before) men did not ſee the miſteries of Chriſt (which thing the (15) veile of Moyſes, wherwith he couered his face when he ſpake to the people, ſignifyed) wheras in the new, they are generally knowne. Now becauſe ſome might ſay, If this be ſo, wherfore after the preaching of the Ghoſpell, ſo many as yet do not beleeue, nor ſee (eſpecially the Iewes) any thing but ſhadowes & figures? Therfore the Apoſtle annexeth, the Ghoſpell to be hid to ſome, becauſe the Deuill hath blinded their vnderſtandings by wicked affections; to whom our Sauiour alſo ſaith, (16) *How can you beleeue that receiue glory one of another?* Thirdly this place is ſo inſufficient to proue the Scriptures to be eaſy, as that the Proteſtant Aretius anſwereth the ſame and ſaith, (17) *But many things remayne obſcure, euen to the Godly &c. who did euer ſufficiently expreſſe the matter of the Trinity &c. I paſſ ouer in ſilence the different vnderſtandings of the places of the Ghoſpell, wherin thou mayeſt fynd among the Interpreters, almoſt ſo many opinions as there be Interpreters.* So confeſſed is it, that not only during the tyme of the old Teſtament, but euen now in the new, the Scriptures are difficult to be rightly vnderſtood.

(15) 2. Cor. 3. 13.

(16) Ioh 5. 44.

(17) Loc. Com. l. 3. f. 164.

CHAP.

CHAP. IIII.

The true State of the Question concerning the Interpretation of Scriptures, and decyding Controuersies by the Priuate Spirit of euery particular Man.

Whether the Sacred Scriptures are made easy to be vnderstood, or our Iudge of all Controuersies, by the Spirit reueyling to euery Priuate man the true sense and determination thereof.

SECT. I.

Catholike Doctrine.

ONCERNING the (1) *certainty and security of things to be beleiued*, it is taught in the Councell of Basil, that the same is not had by *priuate Inspiration, because seeing such Inspiration is hidden and supernaturall, it ought to be manifested by some supernaturall signes or miracles, euen as the Doctrine of the Apostles was confirmed by signes and miracles. If therefore the doctrine of our aduersaryes be had by inspiration, let them shew the signes and miracles, and we will beleiue them; which they will neuer do, seeing the chiefe Verity, to whome it belongeth to worke miracles, cannot giue testimony to a lye or falshood.* An the like is taught by the Councell of Sens in these wordes; (2) *He that followeth the Iudgmēt of his owne Spirit, the steppes of the Orthodoxall Fathers contemned, as a Schismaticke,*

(1) *Or at. Ioan. de Ragusio.*

(2) *Decret. 4.*

and rayſer & fauourer of all hereſies let him be reſtrained from ſo great temerity. In the ſecond Nicene Councell it is taught, that, (3) *Seeing ſome do endeauour to peruert true doctrines, according to that which ſeemeth to them, let no man meruaile if they vſe the words of Scripture: for all Arch-hereticks do take occaſion of their error from Scripture diuinely inſpired. What are truly taught by the holy Ghoſt, malignant men do adulterate with their owne ſenſes: And this the chiefe trumpet of the Apoſtles foretould, to wit Peter, ſaying,* (4) *which the vnlearned and vnſtable peruert according to their deſires. For it is proper to hereticks according to their deſires, to peruert the knowledge of diuine and true doctrine.* And the like inſufficiency of the Priuat ſpirit, for the deciding of Controuerſies, is (5) generally taught by all Catholickes.

(3) Act. 6.

(4) 2. Pet. 3.

(5) Bellar. de verbo Dei, l. 1. c. 4. Rhem. Teſt. p. 684.

(6) See before. c. 2. ſec. 1.

(7) De ſacra ſcript. p. 117. Lub. de Princip. p. 573. Brent. Prolegom. cons. Petrum Sot. Whit. the way to the Church. p. 8. 27. Rogers Def. of the Art. art. 20. p. 103.

(8) Har. 21.

(9) Tract. 45. in Ioan.

(10) Ep. 222.

(11) Aug. de Gen. ad lit. l. 2. c. 18.

Proteſtant Doctrine.

I haue (6) formerly ſhewed that Proteſtants do finally make the Priuat ſpirit the Iudge of their Controuerſies. So Whitaker (7) confeſſed, that *the ignorant in tongues, acknowledge and allow the Doctrine being inſtructed by the holy Ghoſt.* And the like is to be ſeene in Lubbertus, Brentius, D. White, and M. Rogers.

Proteſtants agree with ancient Hereticks.

S. Epiphanius (8) reporteth, that Simon Magus pretended for his errors the aſſiſtance of the *holy Ghoſt.* Only this *holy Ghoſt* he beleiued to be his Concubine Helena: euen as Proteſtants make their Priuat fancies to be their priuat ſpirit. S. Auſtine obſerued that, (9) *There are innumerable who do not only boaſt that they are videntes, or Prophets, but will ſeeme to be illuminated, or enlightened by Chriſt, but are hereticks.* And (10) *all Hereticks who receaue the authority of the Scriptures, perſwade themſelues they follow them, whereas they rather follow their owne errors.* And (11) *they contend not for the true meaning of Scriptures, but for their owne opinions, making that which is the opinion of their owne, to be the meaning of Scripture.* Yea, *Hereſies haue no other origene then this; that euery Hereticke preferrs his owne opinion,*

nion, drawne from his owne proper Spirit, before the Common opinion of the Church.

Proteſtant Errours.

The Proteſtant (12) Libertines and Swenckfeldians do reiect the written word, and rely wholly vpon the internall ſpirit: and they differ from other Proteſtants in this, that though both of them rely vpon the ſpirit, as the ground of their faith, yet theſe caſt away Scripture, and rely only vpon the ſpirit: wheras ordinary Proteſtants admit Scripture, but for the ſenſe therof, they ſubiect it to their ſpirit, which is no leſſe pernicious then the other.

(12) See before Chap. 2. ſect. 2.

SECT. II.

It is proued by Scriptures, that the ſayd Scriptures are not made eaſy to be vnderſtood, or our Iudge of all Controuerſies, by the Spirit reuealing to euery Priuate man, the true ſenſe and determination thereof.

AGaynſt this illuſion & Priuat fancy challenged by all Sectmaiſters, Lutherans, Caluiniſts, Swinglians, Anabaptiſts, Puritanes &c. we are ſpecially forewarned by the ſacred Scriptures ſaying; (1) *Thou ſhalt ſay to them that prophecy of their owne heart &c. Wo to the foolish Prophets, which follow their owne Spirit, and ſee nothing &c. they ſee vayne things, & they diuine lyes, ſaying: Our Lord ſayth, whereas our Lord ſent them not.* (2) *Heare not the words of the Prophets that prophecy vnto you, and deceyue you, they ſpeake the viſion of their owne hart, not from the mouth of the Lord.* (3) *The Prophets prophecy falſly in my name: I ſent them not, and I commanded them not, neyther haue I ſpoken vnto them: lying viſion and decerpt full diuination, guileſulnes and ſeduction of their owne hart, they prophecy vnto you.* Theſe places ſhew that it is vſuall with falſe Prophets, and lying teachers, vnder pretence of being ſent, or inſtructed by the Spirit, to broach their owne Priuat conceypts, and fooliſh fancyes: for this Spirit is ſayd to be the Spirit of their owne hart, the

(1) Ezech. 13. 2. 3. 4. 6. 9.

(2) Hier. 23. 16.

(3) Hier. 14. 14.

effects whereof are blindnes, they see nothing; vanity, they see vayne things; lyes, they diuine lyes; fraud, as foxes in the desertes; and finally punishment, wo to the foolish Prophets, which follow their owne Spirit &c. My hand shalbe vpon the Prophets &c. Let any man Iudge whether these things do not agree with our moderne Spiritualists.

I will shew a liuely Patterne of this proud Spiritualist in Eliu the Busit, who opposed holy Iob, sayng, (4) *I am yonger in tyme and you more ancient, therefore &c. I was afrayd to shew you my sentence. For I hoped that longer age would speake, and that a multitude of yeares would teach wisdome. But as I see there is a Spirit in men, and the inspiration of the Omnipotent giueth wisedome. They of many yeares are not the wise men, neither do the ancients vnderstand Iudgment. Therfore will I speake; heare yet me. I also will shew you my wisdome &c. I am full of words, and the Spirit of my belly streineth me &c.* and sundry such like. Here you see a Puritane in his liuely colours, who though he be but of a late birth, yet by the presumed inspiration of the omnipotent, he preferreth himselfe before the auncient, for wisdome and iudgment. And his reason is, becaufe his very belly is ful of the Spirit: as this proud young fellow against iust Iob, doth not euery new Ghospeller speake the like against the Church, Councels, and Fathers, and all vpon conceipt, that his braines and belly are full of the Spirit?

(4) Iob. 32. 6. &c.

S. Paul affirmeth that (5) *To one by the spirit is giuen the word of wisdome; and to another the word of knowledge, and to another Prophecy; to another discerning of spirits; to another kinds of tongues; to another interpretation of Languages. And all these things worketh one and the same spirit, deuiding to euery one according as he will.* Heere it is expresly taught, that God giueth not to euery man the guift of knowledge, but to one that, and to others other guiftes; wherfore euery priuat man may not presume that he is endowed therwith. For which we must note that these guifts do not necessarily depend or follow iustifying Grace, and so common to all the faithfull and iust; but are speciall guiftes freely giuen, some vpon one, some vpon another, as the text sayth.

(5) 1. Cor. 12. 8. 10.

(6) 2. Pet. 1. 19. 20. 21.

S. Peter hauing compared (6) *the Prophetical word, to a*

Candle

Candle shyning in a darke place, immediatly addeth, *vnderstanding this first, that no Prophecy of scripture is made by priuat Interpretation. For not by mans will was Prophecy brought at any tyme, but the holy men of God spake, inspired with the holy Ghost.* Here by *Prophecy of Scripture*, is vnderstood the sense thereof, for so they are called (7) *Sanct Prophets*, because they did foretell and expound hidden misteries of Scripture; which Prophecy or sense is not to be made by Priuat Interpretation, because not by mans will, or selfe seeming humane conceipt, was prophecy, or the true sense of Scripture brought, or made at any time, but the holy men of God, Prophets and Apostles, inspired by the holy Ghost, spake and expounded the same, not leauing it to the priuat interpretation of euery particular man. S. Iohns aduise is, that, *we* (8) *believe not every Spirit, but proue the Spirits if they be of God: because many false Prophets are gone out into the world &c. He that knoweth God, heareth vs, he that is not of God, heareth vs not. In this we know the Spirit of truth, and the spirit of error.* Here we are admonished not to believe euery one that pretendeth the spirit, because many false teachers will challenge the same, but we are to try them by this, that those which be of God, will heare and obey their Apostles and lawfull Pastors, succeeding the Apostles, and submit themselues to the Church of God, the other that be not of God, will not heare either Apostle, Pastor, or Church, but be their owne Iudges, pretending their Instruction by the spirit.

(7) *Epb.* 4. 11.

(8) 1. *Iohn.* 4. 1. 6.

S. Paul, as it were, for the first conceiuing of true faith, (9) requireth these helps amongst others, of hearing and preaching: (9) *How shall they believe him whom they have not heard? And how shall they heare without a Preacher?* But for the nourishing and preserving thereof, he further exacteth obedience to Pastours, saying, (10) *Obey your Prelates and be subiect to them, for they watch, as being to render account for your Soules:* Yea he affirmeth that these Pastours were placed by Christ in the Church, to this end, that, (11) *Now we be not Children wauering and carryed about with euery wind of doctrine, in the wickednes of men, in craftines, to the circumuention of error.* Now, if the holy Ghost by himselfe alone, did infallibly teach euery Priuat

(9) *Rom.* 10. 14.

(10) *Heb.* 13. 17.

(11) *Epb.* 4. 14.

man, inſpiring into him the true ſenſe of all the Scriptures, and conſequently true knowledge, for the infallible deciding of all doubts and controuerſies, to what end is preaching commanded? to what end are Paſtors appointed in the Church of God, for the teaching and guiding of the people? But to theſe, who euery one ſo much glory of their owne ſpirit, I may iuſtly ſay, as Chriſt our Sauiour ſaid vnto the Iewes, (12) *You are of your Father the Deuill, and the deſires of your Father you will do &c. He ſtood not in the verity, becauſe verity is not in him; when he ſpeaketh a lye, he ſpeaketh of his owne, becauſe he is a lyar, and the Father therof.* For ſo euery priuat Proteſtant expounding the Scriptures according to his owne ſpirit, ſpeaketh of his owne, and conſequently ſpeaketh lyes.

(12) Io. 8. 44.

But ſome Proteſtants will reply, that all theſe Scriptures alledged, are only meant againſt thoſe, who in truth hauing not the Spirit of God, do yet euer pretend and challenge the ſame; wheras all faithfull Proteſtants haue the true Spirit of vnderſtanding and iudging: But beſides that this is barely begged, not proued, I demand whether Luther, Swinglius, Caluin, or any other Proteſtant now *in rerum natura*, be a faithfull Proteſtant, and conſequently had, or hath the true ſpirit of God, euer infallibly directing him, in the true vnderſtanding of the Scriptures? If they affirme, then not only all Catholickes, who haue equall Priuiledge of challenging the ſpirit, but euen others of the learneſt Proteſtants, will conteſt, that he erred, and that grieuouſly in ſundry points of faith, and ſo was not infallibly directed by the ſpirit of God. If they ſay, that the faithfull Proteſtant is not at all times, and in all points of Religion ſo infallibly aſſiſted by the holy Ghoſt, but that ſometimes he may erre; then it followeth euidently, that no Proteſtant pretending to be aſſiſted in that ſort, can be to himſelfe or others an infallible Iudge, in all the weightieſt matters of faith and Religion.

SECT.

SECT. III.

It is proued by the Ancient Fathers, that the Priuat ſpirit is not a Iudge ſufficient, for the deciding of Controuerſies, and interpreting the Scriptures.

WHeras we haue ſeen from S. Peter, *that no Prophecy* (or ſenſe) *of Scripture, is made by Priuat Interpretation:* that is according to S. Chriſoſtome, (1) *not by the Spirit which many brag of, as the ſpirit of God, but falſly pretending it, do ſpeake that which is their owne.* According to S. Clement, (2) *It is to be obſerued, when the Law of God is read, it ought not to be read or vnderſtood, according to the meaning of euery mans owne wit; for there are many things in holy Scripture, which may be wreſted to that meaning, which euery one of his owne accord preſumes to himſelfe: but this cannot be.* S. Hierome affirmeth that, (3) *whatſoeuer heretickes ſpeake, they thinke it to be the Law* (or word of God.) *Neither do they vouchſafe to know what the Apoſtles, what the Prophets thought, but do apply incongruous teſtimonies to their owne meaning: as though it were not a great and moſt wicked manner of teaching, to deprane the Sentences, and to draw the contrary Scriptures to their owne will.* (4) *They haue turned the ſacred words and ſenſes into Idols, which they haue framed out of their owne heart.* (5) *The teſtimonies which the Manichees, Marcion, Ebion, Gnoſtickes do take from the pureſt fountayne of Scriptures they do not ſo interprete as they are written, but they will haue (ſimplicitatem ſermonis Eccleſiaſtici) the playnes of Gods word, to ſignify that which themſelues do thinke.* S. Auſtine reprehendeth the Pelagians, (6) *For that they read all the Scriptures according to their priuat Senſes.* And he ſaith to the Manichees, (7) *You ſee that your worke is, that the authority of Scriptures may be taken away, and that euery mans mynd may be author to himſelfe, what he approueth or diſapproueth in any Scripture, that is, not that he ſhould be ſubiect to the authority of the Scriptures, but that he ſhould ſubiect the Scriptures to himſelfe.* S. Bedes direction is, that, (8) *The Prophets did write, deliuer, and preach, not their owne words, but the words of God: So alſo the reader of them muſt not vſe his*

(1) *Hom. de Spir. Sancto adorando.*
(2) *L. 10. Reg.*
(3) *Ad Paulin. Ep. 2.*
(4) *In Oſe c. 8.*
(5) *Ep. ad Ioan. Hieroſ.*
(6) *De Nat. & Grat. 42.*
(7) *Cont. Manich.*
(8) *In 2. Pet.*

his owne proper Interpretation, least he decline from the ſenſe of the truth. Therfore we affirme that no man preſume to expound Scriptures according to his owne pleaſure.

SECT. IV.

It is proued by Proteſtants that the Priuat Spirit is not our Iudge of Controuerſies.

THis point is ſo cleer and vndenyable, that ſundry Proteſtants do agree with vs heerin againſt their other Brethren. D. Luther teacheth that, (1) *we are not certayne of any Priuat man, whether he hath the Reuelation of the Father or no: but the Church it is whereof it is not lawfull to doubt.* (2) And, *there is no Aſſe in this tyme ſo ſottish and blockish, but will haue the dreames of his owne head, and his opinion accepted for the inſtinct of the holy Ghoſt, and himſelfe eſteemed as a Prophet:* whereof enſueth, as himſelfe complayneth a little before, *That there are as many Sectes Religions among vs, as there be men.* Caluin calleth the, (3) *Fantaſticall, who feyne to themſelues ſecret Reuelations of the Spirit; and proud, who thinke the priuat reading of Scripture to ſuffice them, that they need not the Common Miniſtery of the Church.* (4) *Many falſe Doctours beare (or counterfaite) the title of the Spirit: many mad-men ſtart vp, who rashly boaſt themſelues to be endowed with the Spirit of God &c. They ſpeake in their owne Priuat name, go out in their owne name, vtter out of their owne ſenſe.* Yea writing againſt Swenckfeldius, who contemning the Scriptures, challenged only the Spirit for his Iudge, he diſputeth thus, (5) *If that were a good Spirit, it were the ſame with the Spirit of the Apoſtles, and firſt beleeuing Chriſtians; but the Spirit of the Apoſtles, and firſt beleeuing Chriſtians did not make it ſelfe Iudge contemning the Scriptures: Ergo, it is not a good Spirit.*

(1) De Poteſt. Papæ.
(2) Ep. ad Antuerp. Tom. 2. Germ. Iunæ.
(3) In Ep. ad Eph. 4. 12.
(4) In. 1. Ioan.
(5) Inſtit. l. 1. c. 9. § 1.

Now in like manner may I argue againſt Caluin, and our Engliſh Proteſtãs; If the Spirit which they make their Iudge, were a good Spirit, it were the ſame with the Spirit of the Apoſtles, and the firſt Chriſtians: But the Spirit of the Apoſtles, and the firſt Chriſtians, did not make it ſelf Iudge, but made recourſe in their Controuerſies to S. Peter,

ter, and other Apoſtles, and Prieſts, ſitting in Councell at Hieruſalem, and obayed their ſentence. Ergo the Spirit of Proteſtants is not a good Spirit.

Chemnitius having taught, that, (6) *The guift of interpretation is not common to all, no more then the guift of healing or miracles,* he addeth that, *No man ought to ſtay upon his owne wit, in the interpretation of Scriptures, nor (ſo much as) in plaine places, for it is written, that no Scripture is of Private Interpretation.* 2. Pet. 1.

(6) Exam. part. 1. f. 63.

D. Whitaker auoucheth that, (7) *The teſtimony of the Spirit being Priuat and Secret, is not fit to teach and refell others: And that as often therefore as controuerſy of the Scriptures doth ariſe, we muſt fly to common arguments taken from the Scriptures themſelues and the perpetuall teſtimony of the Church.* So inforced is he to appeale from his Priuat Spirit, to the Scriptures themſelues, and the Church.

(7) Aduerſus Staplet. l. 2. c. 6. p. 370. 337. See Hook. Eccl. Pol. Sec. 8. p. 147.

M. Hooker and others do auouch that, (8) *The outward letter ſealed with the inward witneſſe of the Spirit, is not a ſufficient warrant for euery particuler man to iudge and approue the Scriptures to be Canonicall, the Goſpell it ſelfe to be the Goſpell of Chriſt: but the authority of Gods Church (as he acknowledgeth) is neceſſarily required thereunto.*

(8) Eccl. pol. l. 2. ſec. 14. l. 2. ſec. 8. l. 3. Sec. 1. l. 2. Sec. 7. Whitak. aduerſ. Stapl. l. 2. c. 4. Zanchius in confeſſ. c. 2. Bren. in Prolog.

So that Proteſtants themſelues teach from the Scriptures, that the Priuat Spirit is not a ſufficient Iudge for the decyding of Controuerſies, or interpreting the Scriptures.

SECT. V.

It is proued by reaſon, that the Priuat Spirit, is not our Iudge of Controuerſies.

IN Common Senſe and reaſon we ſee, that in the temporall Common wealth, men generally haue that naturall light wherewith the Law was made, & which is ſufficient to expound the ſame, and yet the interpretation of the Law is not permitted to the Priuat Iudgement of euery man, though they pretend neuer ſo much skill, or ſpeciall affi-

assistance of any reuealing spirit: And if it were, the Commonwealth could not long continue in peace. How much lesse is the interpretation of Scripture, to be permitted to euery man, seeing all haue not that supernaturall light, wherwith the Scripture is to be vnderstood, as I proued before from S. Paul 1. Cor. 12. 10.

Agayne, the holy Ghost which directeth another, is neither seene nor heard of me; wheras a Iudge must both be seen & heard of the parties in strife, they being corporal men.

A Iudge likewise must haue authority to compell both parties to stand to his sentence, otherwise his Iudgement or Sentence would be idle and vnprofitable. But this authority Priuat men (though neuer so much repleniſhed with the Spirit) altogeather want.

Againe, if this Priuat Spirit of euery man, might be approued for a competent Iudge, neuer could hereticke be conuinced or conuerted, or any Controuersy euer ended, euery hereticke preferring his owne Spirit, before the Spirits of others, yea euery one demanding with Sedecias the false Prophet, agaynst the true Prophet Micheas, (1) *Which way paſsed the ſpirit of our Lord from me, that it ſhould ſpeake to thee.*

(1) 2. Paral. 18. 23.

Laſtly, seeing Prot. ground their saluation vpon only Fayth, which say they, doth only iustify; & Faith vpō only Scripture, which according to them, contaynes all things necessary to be beliened; and the Scripture and sense therof, only vpon the Priuat Spirit, by which (excluding Church, Coūcels, & Fathers) they expound the Scripture; it therof followeth that the Priuat Spirit is the principall, or sole ground to thē of their sense of Scripture, the Scripture sense the like ground of their fayth, and this their fayth the like ground of their saluation: wherfore no Protestant can haue greater certaynty of his fayth or saluation, then he hath of this Priuat spirit; whereof seeing he hath none, either from Scripture, Church, Councells, Fathers, common sense, or experience; it must needs follow, that his sole relying vpon the Priuat spirit, must perforce bring him into infinite & inextricable Errors. So many wayes is this Priuat Spirit altogether insufficient for the finall decyding of all Controuersies.

SECT.

SECT. VI.

Obiections from the Scripture, for the Priuate Spirit, answered.

SOme obiect ſuch places of Scripture as ſeeme to affirme, that God himſelfe will teacheth vs all thinges, if we aske it of him: (1) *How much more will your Father from heauen, giue the good Spirit to them that aske him?* (2) *If any of you lacke wiſedome, let him aske of God, who giueth to all men abundantly &c. And it ſhalbe giuen him.* And ſundry ſuch like. Anſwer. 1. Heere is not the leaſt mention made of the ſpirit of Interpreting the Scriptures, which is a guift gratis giuen, and wherof we only ſpeake in this queſtion; but of the ſpirit of Faith, Hope, Charity, and wiſdome neceſſary to Saluation: for according to S. Auguſtine, (3) *Prayer doth not infallibly obtayne, but that which is neceſſary or profitable to the ſaluation of him that prayeth.* Now the guift of Interpreting, as alſo the guifts of tongues, and miracles, and ſuch like numbred togeather by S. Paul, are not alwaies profitable to him that hath them. Therfore as by prayer we cannot euer infallibly obtayne the ſpirit of tongues, miracles &c. Though it be ſaid, *he will giue the good Spirit to them, that aske him*, ſo neither the ſpirit of Interpretation. Secondly, although the places obiected, were to be vnderſtood of the ſpirit or guift of Interpretation, yet no man that prayeth for it, can be certaine that he obtayneth it, becauſe no man can be certaine that he prayeth as he ought, (4) *You aske* (ſaith S. Iames) *and receyue not, becauſe you aske amiſſe &c.* And this we ſee verified in all hereticks, Lutherãs, Caluiniſts, Swinglians, Anabaptiſtes, Puritanes &c. all whom pray for the ſpirit, and yet they are poſſeſſed with moſt different & contradicting Spirits. Such places alſo may be vrged, as ſeeme to inſinuate that God teacheth all truth to euery man. (5) *I will giue my law in their bowels, and in their hearts I will write it &c. and a man ſhall no more teach his Neighbour &c. ſaying: know our*

(1) Luc. 11. 13.
(2) Iac. 1. 5.
(3) Tract. 73. & 101. in Ioan.
(4) C. 4. 3.
(5) Hier. 31. 33. 34.

Lord; for all shall know me, from the least of them euen to the greatest. (6) It is written in the Prophets, and all shalbe docible of God. Euery one that hath heard of the Father, and hath learned, cometh to me. (7) My sheep heare my voyce &c. and they follow me, and sundry such like. Answer. 1. I answer in generall, that both is true, that we are taught by God, as the places obiected do insinuate, and yet ordinarily we are not taught immediatly by himselfe, but by mans ministery, for so is vsuall in the Scriptures, that those things which God doth worke as the Principall Cause, are attributed to him as though he effected them without any instrumentall cause, and that for this cause also, because he giueth vertue and power to the Instruments, that they may worke: So S. Paul affirmeth that, (8) *Neither he that planteth is any thing, nor he that watereth, but he that giueth the increase, God.* And Christ himselfe said to his Apostles, (9) *It is not you that speake, but the spirit of your Father that speaketh in you.* And yet it is cleere, that men as Gods Instruments do plant, water, and speake; therefore though it be said, that God doth teach vs, yet this is vnderstood ordinarily to be by mans Ministery, by whose mouth he speaketh, and is heard, according to that of S. Zacharie, (10) *he spake by the mouth of his holy Prophets, that are from the beginning.* And agreably hereunto Christ, not by himselfe alone, but by Ananias (11) taught Paul, by (12) Philip the Eunuch, & by Peter (13) Cornelius.

(6) Io.6.45.
(7) Io.10.27.
(8) 1.Cor.3.7.
(9) Mat.10.20.
(10) Luc.1.70.
(11) Act.9.7.20.&c.
(12) Act.8.26.&c.
(13) Act.10.6.22.34.
(14) L.de spiritu & lit.c.24.

Secondly, in particular I answer to the first place with S. Augustine, that (14) by those words, *I will giue my Law &c.* is vnderstood the Grace of the New Testament, that is, Faith working by Charity, which God powreth into our hearts, not only that we may know him, but withall may fulfill his Commandements. And by these words, *A man shall no more teach his Neighbour*, is signified the reward of faith, to wit, Beatitude, in which all the Elect shall see God face to face. And though we should vnderstand these last words of this present tyme, yet they only speake of knowing of one God, which not only the Gentiles conuerted, but euen Iewes, Turkes, and hereticks do acknowledge.

To the second text, *And all shalbe docible of God*, I may either

ther answer with S. Cyril, (15) that this is meant of the doctrine of the Ghospell, which Christ, not by Prophets, but by himselfe, taught & preached, according to that of S. Paul, (16) *Diuersly and many wayes in tymes past God speaking to the Fathers in the Prophets, last of all in these dayes hath spoken to vs in his Sonne:* Or I may answer with S. Augustine, (17) that this is vnderstood of the Grace of the holy Ghost, whereby a man is inwardly & sweetly moued by God to beleeue and loue.

(15) *Cyril. in hunc loc.*
(16) *Heb. 1. 1. 2.*
(17) *De gratia Christi c. 12. 13. 14.*

To the third text, *My sheepe heare my voyce*, I answer with S. Augustine, (18) that Christ here speaketh of the Predestinate, who before their death heare Gods calling, and follow him. Besides, God speaketh to his Sheepe, not only by the Scriptures, but also by inward all inspirations, and by the mouthes of their Pastors, of whom he sayth expresly, (19) *He that heareth you, heareth me.* So not excluding by those words (*My sheep heare my voyce*) his Vicars and Pastors, but only enemies, as himselfe directly sayth, (20) *But a stranger they follow not, but flye from him, because they know not the voyce of strangers.*

(18) *In hunc locum.*
(19) *Luc. 10. 16.*
(20) *Ioan. 10. 5.*

In like sort it is vrged, that S. Iohn sayth, (21) *You haue no need that any man teach you; but as his vnction teacheth you of all things.* Answer. 1. It is not here spoken absolutely of the knowledge of all heauenly things, in such sort, that those who haue receaued the holy Ghost, should not need a maister or teacher in any thing: for then to what end should S. Iohn haue written this Epistle, instructing them therby, whom the vnction of the holy Ghost did still instruct in all things? Or to what end should God haue placed in his Church Pastors and Doctors? It is therfore here only spoken of such Doctrine, as they had learned from the Apostles; wherin that they should persist, and not attend to teachers of the contrary. S. Iohn warneth them, as is manifest by the verses precedent, (22) *I haue not written to you, as to them that know it.* (23) *That which you haue heard from the beginning, let it abyde in you.* (24) *These things haue I written to you concerning them that seduce you.* Secondly this place is answered by S. Augustine, speaking thus to S. Iohn. (25) *They had the vnction in whom thou didst speake: thou saidst* (1. Io. 2.) *Because his vnction*

(21) *Io. 2. 27.*
(22) *Ver. 21.*
(23) *Ver. 24.*
(24) *Ver. 26.*

teacheth you all things: wherfore then diſt thou write that Epiſtle? why
(15) Tract 3. in 1. Ep. Ioan. dideſt thou teach them? why dideſt thou inſtruct them? why dideſt thou erect them? And now he anſwereth for S. Iohn, *Brethren here you now ſee a great Miſtery. The ſound of our words beateth the eares; the maiſter is within. Do not thinke that any man doth learne any thing of man: we may admonish with the noyſe of our voyce. If he be not within who teacheth, in vayne is our noyſe &c. He hath his Chayre in heauen, who teacheth the harts. The Prophet ſaid, and he in the Ghoſpell, Mat. 23. Neither be ye called maiſters, for one is your maiſter, Chriſt.* So learnedly teaching, that the Doctrine of faith ought to be attributed to God, not that he alone without mans miniſtery, doth ordinarily teach vs all things, but becauſe he is the principall maiſter of this Doctrine.

(16) 1. Cor. 2. 15. Others obiect thoſe words of S. Paul, (26) *The ſpirituall man iudgeth all things, and himſelf is iudged of no man.* Ergo he is to iudge of the ſenſe of the Scriptures. Anſwer. 1. Though there be ſome ſpirituall men, which do truly Interpret Scriptures, as there be ſome who Prophecy, and who worke miracles, yet to them doth not pertaine the definitiue Sentence of the true ſenſe of Scriptures, or other Controuerſies; becauſe we neither haue certainty of faith, who theſe ſpirituall men be, as alſo it is moſt cleere, that the moſt ſpirituall are ignorant of ſome things. So Eliſeus who had receiued the double ſpirit of Elias, acknowledged of himſelfe, (27) *Our Lord hath hid it from me, and hath not tould me.* And ſundry learned Fathers had excellently the guift of Interpretation, yet neither did they aſſume, or others attribute to any of them in particular, the infallible knowledge of the true ſenſe of all Scripture; wherfore, wheras it is ſaid, that *the ſpirituall man Iudgeth all things*; the meaning is, That he iudgeth as well ſpirituall things as temporall, aſwell heauenly as earthly; according to which S. Paul had ſaid before, (28) *The ſenſuall man perceiueth not thoſe things that are of the ſpirit of God:* But from hence it will not follow, that the ſpirituall man is able to iudge either all diuine and ſpirituall things, or all temporall and earthly matters.

(17) 4. Reg. 4. 27.

(28. Ver. 14.

(29) Againſt the Rhem. Teſt. in Act. 17. 11. Whitak aduerſus Stap. l. 3 c. 7. p. 529.

D. (29) Fulke, D. Whitaker, and others do vrge, that it is written of the People of Berœa, that, (30) *They were daily*

(30) Act. 17. 11.

daily ſearching the Scriptures, if theſe things were ſo as Paul taught. Ergo, the people may iudge by the Scriptures, whether the Church teacheth truely or no. Anſwere. Though S. Paul was an Apoſtle, & could not preach falſe Doctrine, yet this was vnknowne to thoſe of Berœa, and therefore they were not bound preſently to beliue, except they had ſeen firſt ſome miracle, or other credible motiues of beliefe: when then S. Paul proued to thē Chriſt, by the predictions of the Prophets, deſeruedly they ſearched the Scriptures for the ſame. But Chriſtians, to whome it is certayne, that the Church cannot erre in matters of fayth, are bound to receyue her decrees, without all doubt thereof. And if (as ſome thinke) the Berœans formerly beliued, thē their ſearching of the Scriptures, might be for their Comfort and Confirmation. But this Obiection is ſo weake, that D. Bilſon anſwereth the ſame againſt M. Iacob ſaying, (31)

Where you ſay the Berœans are commended by the holy Ghoſt, for not beliuing that which Paul ſpoke of Religion, till they had examined by Scriptures, and ſeen whether the truth were ſo as he vttered, you ſpeake not only vnwiſely, and vntruly, but if you would haue Chriſtians to follow that Courſe, you ſhew intollerable pride againſt the word of God: for the Berœans were commended, (whereas yet they neyther beliued in Chriſt, nor acknowledged Paules Apoſtleſhip) for their readines to heare, and care to ſearch, whether Paul ſpoke true or no. This if you now aſſume to your ſelfe ouer Paules words or writings, you incurre the crime of flat impiety: Paules words to vs that beliue without further ſearch or other credit, are of equall authority with the reſt of the Scriptures, and not to beliue him, till we examine and ſee the truth of his Doctrine, is meer infidelity; So confeſſedly impertinent is this common obiection.

(31) Survey of Chriſtes ſufferinges. p. 84.

Some obiect that the Church receyueth from God inſpiring her the right ſenſe of Scripture, and ſo firſt decydeth the Controuerſy in her mynd, before ſhe can exteriourly decyde what is to be beliued: therefore the Spirit ſpeaking in her hart is the ſupreme Iudge, euen to Catholikes. Anſwere. The motions of the Spirit inſpiring the Paſtours of the Church, are vnknowne to others, and to themſelues are vncertaine, vntill they be outwardly decreed and ſubſcribed

scribed by the head and members of the Church, and so are no Iudiciall sentences, or finall decisions, or rules infallible, eyther to themselues, or others.

(31) Sander. de visib. Mon. l. 4. c. 3. 4.

Others vrge, that in the law of Nature there was no other Iudge but only the Spirit instructing. Answere. (23) Adam during his lyfe was the Chiefe head and directour of Gods people in points fayth: then Seth, Enos &c. And so in succeeding ages, the first borne by Prerogative of his Primogeniture, or some other by Gods spetiall Election, discharged that Office.

Some obiect that the beliewing Gentiles were not subordinate to the high Priest of the Iewes, nor had any other appointed ouer them, and so were only guided by the spirit. Answere. The faythfull Gentiles were not subiect to the high Priest of the Iewes; because they had no such positiue Precept imposed vpon them, but the necessary mysteries of fayth were reuealed vnto them, eyther by God himselfe, or by an Angell, or by some other infallible Tradition. But all this being Extraordinary, can be no warrant for particular men to challenge the lyke, nor preiudice the ordinary Course prescribed by Gods wisdome: especially now in the Law of Grace, when both Iew and Gentile are subiected to one head, according to that of Christ our Sauiour, (33) *Other sheep I haue which are not of this fold; them also must I bring, and they shall heare my voyce, and there shall be made one fold and one Pastour.* This cannot be vnderstood of Christ, as inuisibly gouerning, for so there was alwayes one fold and one Pastour, but of his inuisible headship, and of his secondarie visible Pastour, who is his Vicar vpon Earth; and of whome (34) S. Cyprian interpreteth these very words.

(11) Io. 10. 16. (14) L. 1. ep. 6. ad Magnum.

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

The true State of the Queſtion concerning the bookes of Scripture Canonicall, or Apocryphall.

Whether the bookes of Tobie, Iudith, Wiſedome, Eccleſiaſticus, and the firſt and ſecond of Machabees, be Scriptures truly Canonicall, or Apocryphall.

SECT. I.

Catholike Doctrine.

THE Catholike Church (1) *Setting alwayes this before her eyes, that errours being taken away, the very Purity of the Ghoſpell may be preſerued in the Church; what was promiſed before by the Prophets in the holy Scriptures, our Lord Ieſus-Chriſt the ſonne of God, firſt published by his owne mouth, and afterwards commanded to be preached to* (2) *euery creature by his Apoſtles, as the fountaine of all wholſome truth, and of the diſcipline of manners: And ſeeing that this truth and diſcipline is contayned in the written bookes, and in the Traditions not written &c. following the examples of Orthodoxall Fathers, with like affection of Piety and reuerence, it receyueth and honoureth all the Bookes both of the Old and new Teſtament, ſeeing one God is the Authour of both &c.* It hath further ordained that the Table (or Catalogue) of the ſacred bookes,

(1) Counc. Trid. Sess 4. Decret. de Canonicis Scripturis.

(2) Mar. vlt.

kes, ſhould be adioyned to this decree, leſt doubt might ariſe to any, which bookes they are, which are receyued by the Synod. They are theſe following *of the old Teſtament, fiue of Moyſes, that is, Geneſis, Exodus, Leuiticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy; Ioſue, Iudges, Ruth, foure of the Kings, Two of Paralipomenon, the firſt & ſecond of Eſdras, which is called Nehemias, Tobias, Iudith, Eſther, Iob, Dauids Pſalter of 150. Pſalmes, Prouerbs, Eccleſiaſtes, Canticles, Wiſdome, Eccleſiaſticus, Iſaias, Hieremias, with Baruch, Ezechiel, Daniel, twelue leſſer Prophets, that is, Oſe, Ioel, Amos, Abdias, Ionas, Michaas, Naum, Abacuc, Sophonias, Aggeus, Zacharias, Malachias, the firſt and ſecond of the Machabees. Of the New Teſtament, foure Ghoſpels according to Mathew, Marke, Luke, and Iohn: the Acts of the Apoſtles written by Luke the Euangeliſt: fourteene Epiſtles of Paul the Apoſtle, to the Romanes, two to the Corinthians, to the Galathians, to the Epheſians, to the Philippians, to the Coloſsians, two to the Theſſalonians, two to Timothy, to Titus, to Philemon, to the Hebrewes: two of Peter the Apoſtle, three of Iohn the Apoſtle, one of Iames the Apoſtle, one of Iude the Apoſtle, and the Apocalyps of Iohn the Apoſtle. But if any man ſhall not receiue for ſacred and Canonicall, theſe whole bookes with all their parts, as they are accuſtomed to be read in the Catholicke Church, and as they are in the old Vulgar Latin Edition &c. let him be accurſed.*

(1) Can. 47.

(4) Bellar de verb. Dei. l. 1. c. 4. &c. The Tranſlators of the Old Teſt. in the Argum. of the Macab. and the other Bookes. And in the Prœmiall Annotations.

In the third Carthage Councell it is defined, (3) *that nothing be read in the Church vnder the name of diuine Scriptures, but Canonicall Scriptures. The Canonicall Scriptures are Geneſis, Exodus &c.* And ſo the ſaid ancient Councell proceedeth, making particularly the ſame Catalogue of the Bookes of ſacred Scripture, with the next before recited out of the Counſell of Trent. And the ſame with theſe Councels do (4) Catholiks now believe.

(5) I. de Concil. & Eccleſia.

(6) Exam. Seſſ. 4.

Proteſtants vntruthes.

Luther affirmeth, that *the* (5) *Pope doth bury the ſacred Scripture in dirt and duſt, and hath almoſt abolished the whole Chriſtian doctrine.* (6) Chemnitius anoucheth, that Catholiks are of opinion, that the Pope at his pleaſure, without all teſtimonies of Ancient writers, may of a Booke not Canonicall, make

make it Canonicall, and of the Contrary. And that if the Pope would, the ſacred Scripture would be of no more authority, then Æſops Fables.

Ochinus ſpeaking of the Bookes of Machabees, ſayth, (7) *that they are Apocryphall, it is manifeſt by the Laodicene, and the Africane Councels, yea by all holy Doctours, who making a Catalogue of the Scriptures, make no mention of the Machabees.* But the contrary is euident by the third Carthage Councell cited, and by ſundry (8) ancient writers. And though the Laodicene Councell doth not mention the Bookes of Machabees, as neither doth it mention the Apocalyps, yet doth it no where cenſure them for Apocryphall. So that all heere ſaid by Proteſtants are mere impoſtures, and vtterly deteſted by the Catholike Church.

(7) Dialog. de Purgatorio.

(8) *Aug. l. 2. de doct. Chriſt. c. 8. & de Ciu. Dei. l. 18. c. 36. Innocent. 1. Ep. ad Exſuperium. c. 7. Iſidor. l. 6. Etymol. c. 1.*

Proteſtant Doctrine.

The Engliſh Church hath decreed, that, (9) *In the name of the holy Scripture, we do vnderſtand thoſe Canonicall Bookes of the Old and New Teſtament, of whoſe authority was neuer any doubt in the Church*: and then followeth, *of the names and number of Canonicall bookes. Geneſis, Exodus &c.* For Apocryphall, they number theſe following: *the 3. booke of Eſdras, the 4. booke of Eſdras, the booke of Tobias, the booke of Iudith, the reſt of the booke of Eſther, the booke of Wiſdome, Ieſus the ſonne of Syrach, Baruch the Prophet, the ſong of the 3. Children, the ſtory of Suſanna, of Bell and the Dragon, the Prayer of Manaſſes, the firſt booke of Machabees, the ſecond booke of Machabees.* And theſe their Apocryphall, they ſay, *the Church doth read, for example of lyfe and inſtruction of manners, but yet doth it not apply them to eſtablish any doctrine.* Of the bookes of the New Teſtament, they only ſay in generall, *All the bookes of the New Teſtament, as they are commonly receiued, we do receiue and account them Canonicall.*

(9) Article 6.

To this Rule of making ſuch bookes Canonicall, of whoſe authority was neuer any doubt in the Church, D. Whitakers addeth 2. more, wherby he diſcardeth the Machabees, and ſundry others: (10) *They were written* (ſayth he) *in Greeke, or ſome other forraine language, and not in Hebrew; nor had*

(10) Anſwere to Reinolds. p. 22. 23.

had for their knowne Authors, thoſe whom God hath declared to be his Prophets. So that no bookes muſt be Canonicall with our Engliſh Church, but ſuch as were neuer doubted of in the Church, ſuch as were originally written in the Hebrew, & ſuch as had their authors knowne to be Prophets.

The Lutherans hence teach, that (11) The 2. Epiſtle of Peter, the 2. & 3. of Iohn, the Epiſtle to the Hebrewes, the Epiſtle of Iames, the Epiſtle of Iude, and the Apocalips of Iohn are Apocryphall: as (12) not having ſufficient teſtimony of their Authority. And therfore, that (13) nothing in Controuerſy may be proued out of theſe bookes.

(11) In Enchirid. p. 63. & Exam. part. 2. p. 55.
(12) Exam. part. 1. p. 56.
(13) Ibid. p. 57.
(14) In Prolog. Galeat.
(15) Hiſt. l. 3. c. 25.
(16) L. de viris illuſtr. in Iacobo, Iuda, Petro, Ioanne.
(17) Epiphan. har. 76. Hieron. in c. 5. Michæ. & Præfat. in Ep. ad Philem. Aug. l. 2. cont. Aduerſ. Leg. & Proph. c. 2.
(18) Tom. 3. Germ. f. 40. 41. & in Colloq. Menſal. Ger. fol. 152. 153.
(19) In Colloq. Menſal. c. de lege & Euang.
(20) Ib. fol. 218.
(21) Serm. de Moyſe.
(22) In Conuiual. Colloq. cited by

Proteſtants agree with Iewes, and Heretickes.

S. Hierome (14) relateth, that the Hebrews reiected the bookes of Toby, Iudith, Sapientia, Eccleſiaſticus, and Machabees. Euſebius (15) and S. Hierome (16) report, that ſome before their times doubted of the Epiſtles of Iames, Iude, 2. of Peter, 2. & 3. of Iohn. The Anomeans (17) and other hereticks taught, that all things in S. Pauls Epiſtles, were not inſpired by the holy Ghoſt, but ſome things written only by humane wiſdome: the ſame and worſe do Proteſtants teach here next hereafter.

Proteſtants Errours.

Wheras Moyſes was the firſt that writ any part of Scripture, and he who writ the Law of God, or ten Commandements, Luther thus reiecteth him, and his ten Commandements. (18) *We will neither heare nor ſee Moyſes, for he was giuen only to the Iewes, neither doth he belong any thing to vs.* (19) *I will not receiue Moyſes with his Law, for he is the Enemy of Chriſt.* (20) *Moyſes is the Maiſter of all hangmen.* (21) *The 10. Commandements belong not to Chriſtians.* (22) *Let the 10. Commandements be altogether reiected, and all hereſies will preſently ceaſe, for the 10. Commandements are as it were the fountayne from whence all hereſies ſpring.* Iſlebius Luthers ſcholler taught, (23) *That the Decalogue was not to be taught in the Church.* And from him came

came (24) the Sect of *Antinomans*, who publickly taught, that, (25) *The Law of God is not worthy to be called the word of God. If thou beest a whore, if a whoremonger, if an adulterer, or otherwise a sinner; believe, and thou walkest in the way of salvation: when thou art drowned in sinne, even to the bottome, if thou believest, thou art in the midst of happines. All that busy themselves about Moyses, that is, the 10. Commandements, belong to the Deuill, to the Gallowes with Moyses.*

Luther (26) doth not believe all things to be so done as they are related in the booke of *Iob*: and with him it is, (27) *as it were the Argument of a fable.* He sayth of Ecclesiastes, (28) *This booke is not perfect, many things are taken away, it wanteth hootes and spurres, that is, it hath no perfect sentence.*

Castalio (29) *commanded the Canticles of Salomon to be thrust out of the Canon, as an impure and obscene song, reuiling with bitter reproaches such Ministers, as resisted him therin.*

Caluin (30) doubted whether the *Apostles Creed*, was made by the Apostles. He argueth (31) S. Mathew of *error*, he reiecteth (32) these words, *Many are called, but few are chosen.*

Clebitius opposeth the Euangelists one against another, (33) *Marke and Mathew deliuer the contrary, therfore to Mathew and Marke being two witnesses, more credit is to be giuen then to one Luke, who was not present at the last supper, as Mathew was.* Swinglius (34) and other Protestants affirme, that all things in *S. Paules Epistles are not sacred*, and that in sundry things he erred. Other (35) Protestants charge S. Peter *to haue erred in faith and manners, euen after the descending of the holy Ghost.* Rogers confesseth and nameth sundry of his Brethren Protestants reiecting for Apocryphall (36) *the Epistle vnto the Hebrewes, of S. Iames, the first and second of Iohn, of Iude, and the Apocalyps.* I desire the indifferent Reader here to Iudge, whether any men liuing, but professed Atheistes, did euer like vnto our Protestants so reiect, deride, discarde, and censure the Scriptures themselues, so generally receiued.

Aurifab. cap. de lege.

(21) See Osiand Cent. 16. p. 312. 313. 320.

(24) Sleidan. hist. l. 12. fol. 162.

(25) See Confessio Mansfeildensium Ministrorum, Tit de Antinomis. f. 89. 90.

(26) *In serm. Coniunct. Tit. de Patriarch. & Proph.*

(27) *Tit. de libris Vet. & nou. Test.*

(28) *Petrus Rebeastock. l. 2. Colloq. Latin. Lutheri. cap. de vet. Test.*

(29) See Beza in vita Caluini.

(30) *Instit. l. 2. c. 16. § 20.*

(31) *In Matth. 27. 9.*

(32) *Harm in Matth. 20. 16.*

(33) *Victoria, veritatis, & ruina Papatus, Arg. 5.* (14) Tom. 2. Elenc. f. 10. Fotherby in his 6. Sermons ser. 1. p. 50. Magdeburg. Cent. 1. l. 2. ca. 10. Col. 580. Gualter. in Act. 31. (35) Caluin. in omnes Pauli Ep. in Gal. 2. p. 510. 511. Goad in the Towers Disp. 2. dayes confer. Arg. 6. Whit. de Eccles. Contr. 2. q. 4. p. 223. (36) Def. of the Articles, Art. 6. p. 32.

SECT. II.

It is proued by ſundry reaſons and authorities, that the foreſaid Bookes are truly Canonicall.

IN Confutation of the foreſaid Rules giuen by Proteſtants for the diſcerning of Canonicall Scriptures from Apocryphall, I will begin with ſuch bookes as were reiected or doubted of by ſome Ancient Fathers. It is euident that the Booke of *Heſter* was not admitted within the (1) Canon by S. Athanaſius, S. Gregory Nazianzene, & Melito Africanus. And (2) S. Hierome reiecteth the laſt 7. Chapters thereof. *Baruch* is not expreſſely named or placed by ſuch Auncient Councels and Fathers, as did make a Catalogue of the ſeuerall Bookes of Canonicall Scripture. The auncient belieuing Iewes reiected (3) *the Hymne of the three Children, the hyſtory of Suſanna*, (which alſo was refuſed by (4) Iulius Africanus) and *the Hiſtory of the Dragon, as alſo the bookes of Tobie, Iudith, Wiſedome, Eccleſiaſticus, and Machabees*. Neyther do Melito, Amphilochius, Nazianzenus, or the Councell of Laodicea, number *Tobie, Iudith, Eccleſiaſticus, or the Machabees, in the Catalogue of their Canon*; of all which alſo S. Hierome (5) ſeemeth to doubt. Some ancient writers doubted alſo of the (6) *laſt Chapter of S. Marke Ghoſpell*; others of ſome part (7) *of the 22. Chapter of S. Luke*; others of the (8) *beginning of the 8. Chapter of S. Iohn*, others of the (9) *Epiſtle to the Hebrews*, others of the (10) *Epiſtles of Iames, Iude, the ſecond of Peter, the 2. and 3. of Iohn, and the* (11) *Apocalyps*.

And it is ſo certayne that theſe bookes and parcells of Scripture were doubted of by ſome Doctors of the Ancient Church, as that M. Rogers who defendeth the foreſayd canonizing of Scripture, by being neuer doubted of in the ancient Church, is enforced yet to ſay, (12) *Although ſome of the ancient Fathers and Doctours, accepted not all the Bookes contayned within the volume of the new Teſtament, for Canonicall: yet in the end, they were wholly taken and receyued by the common Conſent of the Church of Chriſt in this world, for the very word of God &c.* D. Bilſon

(1) *Athanaſ. in Synopſi. Greg. Naz. in carmine quod ſcripſit de geminis Scripturis. Melito apud Euſeb. l. 4. hiſt. c. 26.*
(2) *Præfat. in Heſter.*
(3) *Hier. Præfat. in Daniel.*
(4) *Apud Euſeb. Hiſt. l. 6. c. 23.*
(5) *Præf. in Iudith. & l. 10. ad Furium. c. 6. in Prolego. Galeat. & Præf. in libros Salomonis. Præf. in Daniel.*
(6) See in S. Hier. Ep. ad Hedibiam. q. 1.
(7) See Hilar. l. 10. de Trinit. & Hier. l. 2. cont. Pelagianos.
(8) See Euſeb. hiſt. l. 3. c. 39.
(9) See Euſeb. hiſt. l. 4. c. 3. Hier. l. de viris illuſt. in Paulo.

Bilson auoucheth, that, (13) *The Scriptures were not fully receiued in all places, no not in Eusebius tyme: He sayth, the Epistles of Iames, Iude, the 2 of Peter, the 2. & 3. of Iohn, are contradicted as not written by the Apostles. The Epistle to the Hebrewes was for a while contradicted &c. The Churches of Syria did not receiue the 2. Epistle of Peter, nor the 2. & 3. of Iohn, nor the Epistle of Iude, nor the Apocalyps &c. The like might be said for the Churches of Arabia: will you hence conclude* (saith D. Bilson) *that these parts of Scripture were not Apostolicke, or that we need not to receiue them now, because they were formerly doubted of?* The Deanes of Paules and Windsor, in the Towers disputation had with the most illustrious Martyr Campian, in proofe of this point, do thus report of themselues. (14) *For proofe hereof, we alleadged the testimonies of Hierome in Catal. where he thus writeth, The Epistle of Iames is said to be published by some other vnder his name; and of the 2. of Peter he sayth, that it is denied by many to be his. We also alleaged Eusebius writing thus; Those bookes that be gainsaid, though they be knowne to many, be these; The Epistle attributed to Iames, the Epistle of Iude, the later of Peter, the 2. & 3. of Iohn.* With these agreeth D. Walker, affirming in the same Disputation, that (15) *S. Hierome sayth; Concerning that (Epistle) which is written to the Hebrewes, many haue doubted of it: and also concerning the 2. of Peter, he sayth, It was doubted of by many, and so with some were the 2. last Epistles of Iohn &c.* By all which it is cleere, and for such confessed, that if nothing must be admitted for Canonicall Scripture, wherof any doubt was made in the Primitiue Church, as Protestants formerly exacted; then must not only the *Machabees, Tobie, Iudith*, and other Bookes of the Old Testament be discarded out of the Canon, but a farewell also must we giue to some parts of the Ghospels, written by *S. Marke, S. Luke*, and *S. Iohn, the Epistle to the Hebrewes, and the other of S. Iames, S. Iude, S. Peter; S. Iohn and the Apocalyps*; all which yet contrary to their former Rule, our English Prot. are content to accept for Canonicall. So that the foresayd Rule prescribed by Prot. must be accepted for good agaynst *Tobie, Iudith &c.* but it must be reiected for a most false Rule, in regard of the *Epistles of S. Iames, Peter, Iohn &c.* And what it is that maketh this incredible

(10) See Euseb. hist. l. 3. c. 25. Hier. l. de viris illust. in Iacobo, Iuda, Petro, & Ioanne.
(11) See Euseb. hist. l. 3. c. 28. & l. 7. c. 25. Hier. Ep. ad Dardanum.
(12) In his defence of the 39 Articles. p. 31.
(13) Survey of Christes sufferings p. 624.
(14) The 2. dayes Conference. D. 12.
(15) 4. Dayes Conference fo. 2. B.

dible or rather impossible difference, in one and the same Rule? Certainly nothing else, but that some Bookes so doubted of, spake ouer plainly agaynst Prot. Doctrine; and others no lesse doubted of, they hoped they could euade with better colours, and lesse difficulty.

But it is to be obserued yet further, that the foresayd Bookes were neuer so doubted of in the Primitiue Church, but that some then there were, who could testify, that they were set forth by Prophets or Apostles: for the want wherof, the booke of *Enoch* was neuer receiued by the Church. And although some others doubted, and the Church then did not determine the truth; yet, that no more inferreth that the Church since cannot determine it, then that the Counsell of Nice could not decree the booke of *Iudith* to be Canonicall, being formerly doubted of.

(16) In Confessione Wittemberg.

Adde lastly that although the Lutherans sayd, (16) *We call sacred Scriptures those Canonicall Bookes, of the old and new Testament, of whose authority it was neuer doubted in the Church*: Yet the Diuines of Geneua adde to those words, thus, *Although in the Catalogue of the new Testament some bookes may be found, whereof sometymes doubt hath been made by certaine Ancient Doctours of the Church: yet at length, by the consent of the whole Catholike Church, they also were accounted and receyued for Canonicall; therfore vnderstrudly, for the doubts of some, are cast behind*. So crooked, imperfect and wanting is that Rule of making onely such bookes Canonicall, as were neuer doubted of, in the Primitiue Church.

(17) To wit, from Chap. 2. ver. 4. to the end of the 7. Chapter.

(18) See all our English Protestant Bibles.

To come now to the 2. Rule whereby true Scriptures must be discerned frō false, which is the restrayning the Old Testament to haue been written only in the Hebrew, so that whatsoeuer is not found in the Hebrew, must be reiected as Apocryphall: But besides that, it is no litle temerity to restrayne the holy Ghost, to one onely language in the writing of the Scriptures; the falshood and vanity hereof is cleerly discouered, by example of *Daniel*, a good part, whereof, (17) though not written in Hebrew, is yet by our (18) Aduersaries themselues acknowledged for Canonicall.

In like sort concerning the third Rule, it is most vntrue,

true, that God would direct by his holy Spirit, no authors in their writings, but such as were knowne, and also further declared by certaine testimony to be Prophets: for Protestants themselues cannot yet tell, who were Authours of the seuerall Bookes of Iudges, the 3. and 4. of Kings, the two of Paralippomenon, and the Bookes of Ruth, and Iob. In so much as D. Whitaker himselfe doth directly answere his owne obiection, saying, (19) *The authours of many Bookes are not knowne; as of Iosue, Ruth, Paralippomenon, Hesther &c.* And (20) *wereceyue* (sayth D. Willet) *many Bookes in the Old Testament, the Authours whereof are not perfectly knowne.* Yea Caluin, Beza, and the (21) publishers of certaine of our English Bybles, in the Preface or Argument vpon the Epistle to the Hebrewes, do all of them professe to rest doubtfull of the Authour thereof: Caluin and Beza there affirming, that it is not written by S. Paul. So that though some parcels of the Bible haue not their Authors or Penners knowne, much lesse knowne to be Prophets, yet by lyke examples of other approued Scriptures, it maketh nothing against their sacred and diuine Authority.

(19) *Defensa Script. p. 602.*
(20) *Synops. p. 4.*
(21) *Of Anno 1584. and 1578. See Caluin. in Heb. 2. 2.*

Lastly, wheras Protestants make the written word of God, or the reuealing Spirit, their generall Rule wherby to square them in all doubts; it is so manifest, that by neither of these meanes, the Canonicall Scriptures can be discerned from the Apocryphall, as that M. Hooker teacheth to the contrary, that, (22) *Of thinges necessary, the very chiefest is to know, what bookes we are bound to esteeme holy, which point is confessed impossible for the Scripture it selfe to teach: for* (23) (sayth he) *If any one Booke of Scripture did giue testimony to all, yet still that Scripture which giueth credit to the rest, would require another Scripture to giue credit vnto it. Neither* (24) *could we euer come to any pause wherein to rest, vnles besides Scripture there were something also acknowledged.* Herein M. Hooker writeth so Catholikly, that he is therfore reproued by a Puritane (25) Brother. In like sort D. Whitaker teacheth, that true Scriptures cannot be discerned from counterfait, by *the* (26) *testimony of the Spirit: the which* (sayth he) *being priuat and secret, is not fit to teach and reproll others.*

(22) *Eccl. Pol. l. 1. sec. 14 pag. 85.*
(23) *Ibid. l. 2. c. 4. p. 107.*
(24) *Ibid. p. 103.*
(25) See the Christian letter to that Reuerend man M. Hooker. p. 9.
(26) Aduersus Staplet. l. 2. c. 4. p. 370. & p. 357. and see Hook. in his Eccl. pol. sec. 8. p. 147.

Wherfore the only meanes remaining, wherby infallibly to diſcerne true Scriptures from falſe, is (as all Catholicks teach) the Church of Chriſt. A truth ſo cleere, as that forbearing all other proofes, I may well content my ſelfe with the manifold acknowledgments of Proteſtants themſelues. To this purpoſe then D. Fulke auoucheth, that, (27) *The Church of Chriſt hath Iudgment, to diſcerne true writinges from counterfait, and the word of God from the writings of men, and this Iudgment she hath of the holy Ghoſt.* With him agreeth D. Iewel, affirming, that, (28) *The Church of God hath the ſpirit or wiſdome, wherby to diſcerne true Scriptures from falſe.* M. Hooker having before taught, that true Scriptures cannot be knowne, vnleſſe beſides Scripture there were ſome thing which might aſſure vs; this Something afterwards he acknowledgeth (29) *To be the authority of Gods Church*, or (as D. Whitaker termeth it) (30) *The Eccleſiaſticall Tradition: An argument* (ſayth he) *wherby may be argued and conuinced what Bookes be Canonicall and what not.* With whom accordeth another Proteſtant writer (31) much commended by Bullinger, (32) affirming that, *The Church is indued with the ſpirit of God, and that the diligence and authority of the Church is to be acknowledged herein, which hath partly giuen forth her teſtimony of the aſſured writinges, and hath partly by her ſpirituall Iudgment refuſed the writinges which are vnworthy.* Yea he further aſſureth vs, with S. Auſtine (33) and Tertullian, that, *we could* (34) *not beleiue the Ghoſpell, were it not that the Church taught vs, and witneſſed that this Doctrine was deliuered by the Apoſtles.* And the like might be ſhowed by ſundry other (35) Proteſtant writers.

Wherfore to conclude, ſeeing the ſacred Scriptures of God cannot be diſcerned from the Apocryphall writinges of men, either by that they haue been neuer doubted of, or becauſe they were originally written in Hebrew, or had for their penners knowne Prophets, or by any Proofe from the Scriptures themſelues, or the reuealing ſpirit, but only in that the true diſcerning thereof, is confeſſed by the ſentence and determination of the Church of Chriſt; it remaineth next to be examined, whether the foreſaid bookes of Eccleſiaſticus, Wiſdome, Toby, Iudith, Machabees &c. reiected by

(17) Anſwer to a Counterf. Cath. p 5.
(18) Defence of the Apology. p. 101.
(19) Eccl. Pol. p 146. & 116. And ſee Aret. his Examen. p. 24. Bachmanus his Centuriæ tres. p. 267.
(10) Aduerſus Stap. p. 300. 198. 24. 25. and againſt Reinolds. p. 44.
(31) Author of the Script. and the Church. f. 71. 72. 74. 75.
(32) Ibid. in the Preface.
(33) *Tom. 6. cont. ep. Fundam. c. 5. Tertul. l. de Præſcript. c. 6.*
(34) Scripture and the Church. p. 72. 74. 75. And ſee Melancton in Ep. ad Rom.

by Proteſtants as counterfait, and believed and defended by Catholickes as Canonicall, were euer admitted, acknowledged and approued by the Church of Chriſt, as ſacred, diuine, and the true word of God.

c.14. pa. 358. 359. (33) See Pet. Mart. in his com. Pla. in Engliſh. part. 2. c. 6. Sec. 8 p. 42. Chemn. Exam. part 2. p. 69. Lubb. de principijs Chriſt. dog. l. 2. c. 4. p. 18.

SECT. III.

That the Primitiue Church of Chriſt, and the Councels therin celebrated, haue admitted and approued for Canonicall, the foreſaid Bookes of Eccleſiaſticus, Wiſdome, Toby, Iudith, Machabees &c.

HAuing elswhere proued from the ample Confeſſions of the learnedſt Proteſtant Doctors, that the Primitiue Church continued the true Church of Chriſt, during the firſt 500. or 600. yeares; I will now only make manifeſt, that the ſaid Church admitted and approued the foreſaid Bookes, as truly ſacred, diuine, and Canonicall. Which though I might conuince at large, by producing the particular ſayings of Fathers, and Decrees of Councels, yet ſeeing the Caſe on our behalfe is ſo cleere, as that our Aduerſaries themſelues do confeſſe what I intend to proue, I will only ſet downe ſuch graunts as they affoard in our behalfe.

Whereas in the third Carthage Councell, whereat S. Auſtine and ſundry other Fathers and Biſhops were preſent and ſubſcribed, it is expreſſely defyned, that (1) *Nothing be read in the Church, vnder the name of diuine Scriptures, beſides Canonicall Scriptures.* And, *the Canonicall Scriptures are Geneſis, Exodus &c. fiue bookes of Salomon &c.* (whereof *Eccleſiaſticus and Wiſdome* are two) *Tobie, Iudith, Eſther &c. two bookes of Machabees &c.* Wheras alſo the ſame Canon of Scripture is made and numbred particularly by (2) S. Auſtine himſelfe, as alſo by Innocentius, Gelaſius and other Ancient writers; the truth heerof is ſo manifeſt, that the ſame is confeſſed by ſundry Prot. writers, and the ſame Councell and Fathers (inſteed of better Anſwere) are ſeuerely reprehended for the ſame.

(1) *Can* 47. (2) *De doct. Chriſt. l. 2. c. 8. Innocent. Ep. ad Exuperium. c. 7. Gel. Tom. 1 conc. in Decret. cum 70. Epiſ. Iſid. l. 2. Etymol. c. 1. Rabanus l. 1. Inſtit. cleric. Caſſiodorus l. 1. diuin. arum lectionum.*

Mathæus Hoe reproueth the Carthage Councell in theſe

words. (3) *The Councell of Carthage hath decreed for Canonicall, all the bookes of the old Teſtament, excepting the 3. and 4. of Eſdras, the 3. of Machabees &c. I adde, that the Councell ought not to haue Canonized more bookes, becauſe it had not authority.* Poliander likewiſe ſaith, (4) *To come now to the Error of ſome Councels, the Councels of Carthage, and Florence haue enrolled for Canonicall Bookes, and as diuinely inſpired &c. the bookes of Toby, Iudith, Wiſdome, Eccleſiaſticus, and the Machabees &c. And the Popes Innocentius and Gelaſius, haue reckoned theſe bookes among the Canonicall.*

(3) Hiſt. Tripar. Theol. p. 48.
(4) In his Refutation p. 44.

Hiperius anoucheth, that (5) *In the third Carthage Councell there are added to the Canon &c. Sapientia & Eccleſiaſticus, two bookes of Machabees, Toby, Iudith &c. All which bookes in the ſame order numbreth Auſtine, Innocentius, and Gelaſius,* for which he at large afterwards reiecteth their Iudgment. *I graunt* (ſaith (6) Lubbertus) *certaine of theſe bookes to be admitted by the Carthaginians, but I deny that therfore they are the word of God, for no Councels haue that authority.* So confeſſed it is that the foreſaid Bookes were holden Canonicall by the Councels and Fathers of the Primitiue Church.

(5) Method Theol. l. 1. p. 64.
(6) De princip. Chriſt. dogm. l. 1. c. 4 p. 8.

Now, where our Engliſh Doctors in the Diſputation (7) had in the Tower Anno 1581. with Fa. Ed. Campian Martyr, did publickly and ſeriouſly anſwere, that S. Auſtine numbring the foreſaid Bookes within the *Canon*, vſed the word, *Canon*, improperly, as not meaning therby that the bookes now in queſtion were properly Canonicall, but only that they were in the Canon of manners, not of Doctrine; firſt, this appeareth to be moſt vntrue, in that S. Auſtine ranketh theſe bookes in the ſame order with Geneſis, & the reſt of vndoubted authority, & therfore by the ſame reaſon according to S. Auſtin, theſe other bookes ſhould not be properly Canonicall. Secondly S. Auſtine was one who ſubſcribed to the foreſaid Carthage Councell, and his meaning with the ſaid Councell and other Fathers, is ſo Roman Catholike, as that they are therfore all of them reproued by ſundry Proteſtant (8) writers, which had bene blamleſſe, euen according to Proteſtants, if they had taken the word (*Canonicall*) only improperly.

(7) The firſt dayes Conference.
(8) Reinolds in his Concluſions, annexed to his Conference. p. 699. 700. Zanchius de ſacra Script. p. 31. 33. Hoſpith. hiſt. Sacram. part. 1. p. 100. Trelcatius loc. com. p. 15. Hoe Tract. Tripart. Theol. p. 46. Parker ag. Symbol. part. 2. p. 2. 50. Field of the Church. p. 246. 247.

But

But Brentius auoucheth more in generall, that (9) *There are some of the Ancient Fathers, who receiue* (sayth he) *these Apocryphall bookes into the number of Canonicall Scriptures: and in like sort some Councels command them to be acknowledged as Canonicall. I am not ignorant what was done, but I demand whether it was rightly & Canonically done?* D. Couell aryseth yet higher, not only confessing S. Augustines like Iudgment had of the *Booke* (10) *of Wisdome*, but withall further affirmeth of all these Bookes, that, *If* (11) *Russinus be not deceiued, they were approued as parts of the Old Testament, by the Apostles*. And if you desire to ascend yet higher, you shall find (12) D. Field, and M. Hutton both of them to acknowledge, that some of the *Ancient Iewes* receyued the foresayd Bookes for truly Canonicall.

But though all the Iewes had reiected the forsaid bookes, yet we Christians are to be directed heerin (as is confessed (13) before) by the Church of Christ. And according to this (14) S. Austine sayth of the *Bookes of Machabees, not the Iewes, but the Church accounteth (them) for Canonicall.* Saint Hierome also maketh the like opposition, betweene the Iudgement of the Hebrews, & the Nicene Councell concerning the booke of Iudith, saying, (15) *With the Hebrews the booke of Iudith is read among the Hagiographall &c.* (which they receyued into their Canon) *but because we read that the Nicene Councell accompted this in the number of holy Scriptures, I haue yielded.* In like sort writeth S. Isidore, (16) *Though the Hebrewes do not receyue (the Machabees) into their Canon, yet the Church of Christ doth honour them among the diuine Bookes*: So litle forceth it, what the Iewes thought, but what the Church determineth concerning the Canonicall Scriptures: And so cleere it is, that the foresayd Bookes reproued by Prot. for Apocryphall, were confessedly approued by the Fathers and Councells of the Primitiue Church for Canonicall.

(9) Apol. Confess. Wittemb. And see Bucers scripta Anglicana p. 713.

(10) Against Burges p. 76. 77.

(11) *Ibid. p. 87.*

(12) Of the Church. p. 205. 246. Hut. 2. part of his answere. p. 276.

(13) See before Chap. 5. sect. 2.

(14) *De Ciu. Dei. l. 18. c. 36.*

(15) *Prefat. Iudith.*

(16) *L. 6 Etymol. c. 1.*

SECT. IIII.

That Proteſtants themſelues do defend the foreſayd Bookes.

VVHereas many of the Ancient Iewes would not admit the foreſayd Bookes into their Canon, the Proteſtant Bibliander cenſureth this to be, *The rashnes of the Iewes*; In which his Cenſure, he is approued by the Proteſtãt Scelteo in his booke of the ſecond comming of Chriſt, engliſhed by (1) M. Rogers, for the ſuppoſed worth therof.

Concerning all the foreſayd Bookes pretended now to be Apocryphal, the Caluiniſts of Geneua do teach that, (2) *We are not to ſtand to the Cenſure of the Iewes, in regard of this mayming of the Canon of the Scriptures: and in theſe bookes there are true Prophecyes, and hidden myſteryes, which could not be ſpoken but by the holy Ghoſt, who for preſeruation of that Church which he gouerneth and aſſiſteth, hath moued the mynd, and directed the hand of writers to write theſe things.*

D. Bancroft in the very (3) *Conference before his Maieſty*, reiecteth the obiections of the Iewes made againſt theſe Bookes, calling them, *The old Cauils of the Iewes, renewed by Hierome, who was the firſt that gaue them the name Apocrypha, which opinion vpon Ruffinus his Challenge, he after a ſort diſclaymed.* Yea D. Bancroft ſo fully defendeth the foreſayd Bookes, that other of his Brethren charge him to ſay that, (4) *The Apocrypha were giuen by inſpiration from God:* which is all one, as to affirme them to be truly diuine and Canonicall Scriptures.

And as concerning the booke *Eccleſiaſticus*, it is defended to be truly Canonicall by the Prot. writers (5) Laſcicius, and M. Parker: of which latter D. Willet ſayth, (6) *How audacious is this fellow, that contrary to the determination of the Church* (of England) *dare make Eccleſiaſticus a booke of Canonicall Scripture.* (7) Caluin calleth the authour of this booke *A Saint.* And other Prot. (8) cyte it, and aſcribe it to *Salomon.* And alſo affirme, (9) *that therein are contayned diuine, ſingular, and*

(1) *fol. 6.*
(2) *Admonitio ad lectorem ante Biblia Calu. Anno 1551. per Ioan. Torneſium in folio edita.*
(3) Pag. 80.
(4) The 2. part of the Miniſters defence, pag. 208.
(5) *Ep. ad Volanum.*
(6) *Londoromaſtix. p. 89.*
(7) *In Pſychopannichia propè initium.*
(8) *Clypæus Calu. ſides dial. 2.*
(9) *Admonitio Miniſt. ante hunc librum edit. 1561. & 1570.*

and ancient historiesof men approued by God.

D. Couell in answere to some that impugned these Bookes, saith thus, (10) *We could without violence haue afforded them the reconcilement of other Scriptures, and vndoubtedly haue proued them to be most true.* In like sort Conradus Pelican Professour at Tigure, writing his Commentary vpon the foresayd Bookes, sayth, (11) *I easily yielded &c. especially seeing those bookes were alwayes accompted so Ecclesiasticall and Biblicall, that euen from the Apostles tymes they were read in the Catholike Church, with much reuerence, although they were not produced in authority against the Iewes as Canonicall, who receyued not these into their sacred Canon: whereas they doe not only not contradict in any thing, the writings of the Law and the Prophets, but also &c. for the most part they cleerly carry the right style of the holy Ghost; certayne knots (*or difficulties*) being intermingled, which are found more easy to be loosed then some haue thought &c. Whereupon they were reuerenced and read by holy men, yea the sayings therof are found to be alleaged by the Apostles.* So cleere it is that the forsaid Bookes are truly Canonicall Scriptures, euen by the Confessions of Protestantes themselues.

(10) Answer to Burges p. 85.

(11) Ep. Dedic.

SECT. V.

Sundry Obiections produced against the foresaid Bookes, answered.

WHere it is vsually obiected by many Protestants, that in the foresaid Bookes there are many repugnancies or Contradictions, and Consequently that they are not inspired by the holy Ghost: To omit that in those Scriptures, which are belieued by all to be Canonicall, there are many hidden difficulties and seeming (1) repugnãcyes, which yet notwithstanding, we are bound to acknowledge the same Scriptures to be true and sacred; I will for breuity only alledge, what other Protestants thinke, and answere themselues, to the foresayd pretended Contradictions in the Bookes of Machabees, Tobie, &c. D. Couell

(1) 4. *Reg* 8. 9. 2. *Paral.* 5. 10. & *Heb.* 9 4. *Act.* 9. 7. & *Act.* 22. 9. *Mat.* 20. 20 & *Mar.* 6. 8. *Mat.* 26 34. & *Mar.* 14. 68. *Mar.* 15. 25. & 16. 19. 24. *Luc.* 3. 35. 36. & *Gen.* 22. 22. And see Iewels Def. p. 361.

(23

(as before) answereth thus, (2) *We could without violence have afforded them the restauration of other Scriptures, and undoubtedly have proved them to be most true:* And he (3) particularly answereth cernine of the pretended repugnancyes. Conradus Pellican confesseth, that in these booke, (4) *certayne knotes* (or difficulties) *are intermingled, which are found more easy to be loosed, then some have thought &c. Whereupon they were ever reverenced and read by holy men, yea the sayings thereof are found to be alleaged by the Apostles.* And agreably heerunto M. Hutton at large answereth and cleereth the common Obiection agaynst (5) *Iudith*, and the like in behalfe of (6) *Ecclesiasticus* & (7) *Daniel*. And where it is obiected that these bookes were reiected, omitted, or doubted of by S. Hierome, & some others of the Fathers of the Primitive Church, as also that they were not first written in the Hebrew; these are at large cleered and answerd (8) heertofore by sundry Protestant writers.

(1) Answere to M. Burges pa. 85.
(2) Ibid. p. 87. 88 89. 90.
(4) Ep. Dedic.
(5) 2. part. of the Answere p. 238. 239.
(6) Ibid pag. 247.
(7) Ibid. pag. 246. And see Bucers Scripta Anglicana.
(8) See heretofore, sec. 2. p. 117. &c.

But yet more in particular agaynst the Booke of *Tobie*, it is obiected, that in the third Chapter it is sayd, that Sara whome younger Tobie was to marry dwelled in Rages a Citty of the Medes, where also Gabel was, *Tob.* 4. and yet in the ninth Chapter it is sayd, that when Tobie came to the place where Sara was, he sent from thence the Angell to Gabel in Rages: therefore Sara's house was not in Rages, as it was sayd in the third Chapter. Answere. In the third Chapter, not the Citty it selfe of Rages is there so called, but some place there neere vnto it, as he is sayd to dwell in Lõdon, who dwelleth in Westminster, or other place neere adioyning.

Agaynst the Booke of *Wisdome*, Caluin (9) obiecteth, that it erreth in affirming that *Idolatry* begunne by superstitiously honouring the Images of the dead, seeing Labans Idols and others more ancient, were before any Images of dead men were honoured. Answere. Calvin supposeth that which is false, to wit, that Labans Idol was not the Image of a man: for the Hebrew word *Teraphim*, so signifieth, and the English Bibles of 1552. and 1578. translate *Images*. But because they were *Images* of false Gods, and for that Laban

(9) In R. 1. c. n. 5. 8.

called

called them his Gods, the Bible of 1603. translateth it better, *Idolls*, as the Latin and Greeke haue. It is also certaine, that (10) Ninus king of the Assirians long before Laban, set vp the Image of his Father Belus (called Iupiter) to be publickly honoured by the people for a God: which though it be the first that is recounted, to be publickly set vp to be adored, yet this doth not hinder, but that the first priuat Idolatry, was the Image of the Sonne dead, made by his Father, and by him priuatly honoured, as the booke of *Wisdome* mentioneth, (11) and seuerall good Authors teach.

(10) See *Eusebius in suo Chron. Cyril. l. 3. in Iul. prope fin.*

(11) *Cypr. l. de idol. Vanit. init. Christ. ho. 87. in Mat. Egesip. apud Hier. l. de viris illust.*

Sundry things are vrged against the Bookes of Machabees, as first by D. Fulke, that, (12) the author *commendeth one Razis for killing himselfe, which is contrary to the word of God.* But S. Austine shall answere him, saying, (13) *Touching this his death, the Scripture hath told how it was done, (but) it hath not commended it as though it were to be done:* for though the Author reporting the truth of the fact, say, that *he came boldly, & threw downe himselfe manfully*, yet doth he not commend it, as done vertuously. The Booke of *Iudges* (14) reporteth how Sampson killed himselfe and others, saying, *Let me dye with the Philistines*; and the Apostle yet numbreth (15) him among the faithfull, and S. Austine (16) affirmeth that he was commanded hereto, by peculiar inspiration: therfore though Razis had been commended, yet had it hereby been sufficiently answered and explained.

(12) Ag Pur. pag. 209. Chark. in the Towers Disp. the 4. dayes Conf.

(13) *l. 2. cont. Ep. Gaud. c. 23. & ep. 61. ad Dulcit.*

(14) *C. 16. 30.*

(15) *Heb. 11. 32.*

(16) *De Ciu. Dei. l. 1. c. 21.*

Fulke (17) and others further vrge, that the Author craueth pardon for his writing, *a thing* (thinke they) *far from the Maiesty of Gods spirit.* Also that his Booke *is an Abridgement* (18) *of the fiue Bookes of Iason the Cyrenean*, whereas *the holy Ghost maketh* (as Fulke thinketh) *no abridgment of other mens writing.* And that he sheweth, *what labour and sweat it was to him, in making this Abridgment, which sauoureth not of that spirit, by which the Scriptures were written.* Answ. He doth insinuate for pardon, not of errors, but elocution, if he hath not spoken so worthily. In which sense S. Paul said, (19) *Though rude in speach, yet not in knowledge.* And, (20) *I speake not according to God, but as it were in foolishnes.* And he affirmeth the *Romanes* to be (21) *Replenished with all knowledge*, insinuating therfore his

(17) Ag Pur. pag. 209. Chark. in the Towers Disp. the 4. dayes Conf.

(18) *2. Mach. 2. 24 27.*

(19) *2. Cor. 11. 6. 17.*

(20) *Rom. 15. 14. 23.*

(21) *Ro. 15. 23.*

owne excuſe in writing to them, ſaying, *I haue written to you more boldly in part, as it were putting you in remembrance*: he requeſteth alſo the Corinthians, (22) *to beare ſome little of his folly.*

(22) 2. Cor. 11. 1.

D. Morton would further euade, by affirming, that (23) the Apoſtle ſpeaketh vpon the aduerſaries ſuppoſall, but this Author (of Machabees) κατ' ἐπιτίμησιν, and vpon the knowledge of his owne weaknes: as alſo the holy Ghoſt neuer willeth what he cannot, neither doth he euer doubt that he cannot what he will. But it is vntrue, that the Apoſtle ſpeaketh in the forſaid places, only vpon his Aduerſaries ſuppoſall, for his words are much more abſolute, then theſe other of the Author of the Machabees, *If well, and as befitteth the Hiſtory, this is that which I would: but if leſſe worthily, I am to be pardoned.* Wheras S. Paul acknowledged, that he was *rude in ſpeach*; that *he ſpoke not according to God*, but as it were in *foolishnes*, and requeſted the Corinthians *to beare ſome little of* (his) *folly*: neither can the pretended doutfulnes of the Author of the Machabees, be more imputed to the want of the holy Ghoſt directing, then the confeſſed rudeneſſe and folly of the Apoſtle; none of theſe arguing any want of truth in that which was written, but only want of Elocution in the writers.

(23) Apol. part. 2. l. 2. c. 3.

As to the ſecond, the *Booke of Kings* ſignifyeth in diuers places, that it abridgeth ſtories, telling where they be written more at large in other bookes not Canonicall. S. Marke is called *the* (24) *Abridger of S. Mathew*: and euery Sermon & Letter in the Actes of the Apoſtles, is but an Abridgment.

(24) Aug. de conſenſu Euang. l. 1. c. 2.

To the third, S. Luke writ his Ghoſpell, (25) *Hauing diligently attained to all things from the beginning*. And Whitaker acknowledgeth moſt cleerly, that an (26) *Endeauour to learne & write the certaine truth*, (and) *to enquire the truth with all diligence, detracteth nothing from the wiſdome and maieſty of Gods ſpirit*: And as for the labour taken in writing therof, it is nothing more preiudiciall to him, then to S. Paul, who in the inditing of his Epiſtles, did ſometimes (27) for his eaſe, vſe another mans handwriting.

(25) Luc. 1. 3.
(26) Againſt Reinolds. p. 391 And ſee cont. Duræum l. 4. p. 347.
(27) Rom. 16. 22. 1 Theſſ. 3. 17.

Others obiect a contrariety through ignorance of the ſtory, as that in ſome places it is ſaid, Antiochus did dye in Baby-

Babylon, and in others, that he dyed in Nanea, and yet againe, that he dyed by the way, ſo that *This one man* (as Willet(28) vrgeth) *dyed thrice*. Anſwere. The Bookes of Machabees make mention of ſundry Princes, Enemyes to the Iewes, who bore the name of Antiochus, as Antiochus (29) the great, Antiochus (30) the noble, & Antiochus the ſonne of Demetrius(31). But though the before mentioned chãces ſhould all of them concerne one & the ſame Antiochus, yet they may be wel taken to ſignify his one death in one place: For in the chãce at (32)Nanea, Antiochus and the Captaine there mẽtioned, were two ſeuerall perſons, & the Captaine only is there ſaid to be ſlaine. And as for the death of Antiochus mentioned(1. *Mach.* 6. 16.) & his death elſwhere (2. *Mach.* 9. 5. 28.) mentioned to be by the way in a ſtrange Country, this laſt ſignifyeth one and the ſame death with that of 1. *Mach.* 6. 13. where he likewiſe mentioneth that he muſt dye in a ſtrange land, the preſence of his friend Philip being alike alſo mentioned in (33) both the ſayd places. But to anſwere in generall, whereas Perkins profeſſeth to (34) *reuerence the Bookes of Machabes, and the reſt of the Apocrypha, preferring them before any other bookes of men*, if Proteſtants did but reuerence them as Saluſt, or Liuy, they would neuer think them to be ſo groſly repugnant, as their foreſayd obiection pretendeth. And though ſome (35) examples of ſeeming incongruity (which we could not thus eaſily auoyd) ſhould appeare in any of the Scriptures, yet ought we religiouſly to impute the difficulty to our owne ignorance, rather then to charge the Scriptures with vntruth.

(28) Syuop. p. 11.
(29) 1. Mach. 1. 11. & 8. 9.
(30) 1. Mach. 1. 11.
(31) 1. Mach. 15. 1.
(32) 2. Mach. 1 13, 14, 15. &c.
(33) 1. Mach. 6. 14. & 2. Mach. 9. 29.
(34) Reform. Cath. p. 304.
(35) See heretofore Cap. 3. ſec. 5.

Others yet obiect, that thoſe perſons for whome Iudas Machabeus cauſed ſacrifice to be offered, had (36) *vnder their Coates &c. ſome of the Donaries of the Idols &c. from which the Law forbiddeth the Iewes*: and therefore Iudas might not lawfully pray for them. Anſwer. All may be prayed for, ſauing ſuch as are knowne to dye in finall impenitence, and therefore Iudas Machabeus (not knowing the contrary) might charitably hope, that many of thoſe that were ſlaine, did repent them of that offence before their death, according as the Prophet ſayth, (37) *when he ſlew them, they ſought him, and returned.*

(36) 2. Mach. 12. 40.
(37) Pſ. 78. 34.

And that Iudas had this opinion of them, is moſt playnely
(38) 2. Mach. 12. 45. ſignifyed by theſe words, (38) *Becauſe he conſidered, that they which had taken their ſleepe with goodlines, had very good grace Leyd vp for them*. So childiſh and weake are theſe obiections, in regard of the greateſt power and authority of the Church, decreeing the foreſayd Bookes to be truly Canonicall,

CHAP.

CHAP. VI.

The true State of the Queſtion, concerning the Tranſlation of the Bible.

Whether the Tranſlation of the ſacred Scriptures, ordinarily called the Old Vulgar Latin Tranſlation, be to be vſed, & preferred before all Tranſlations made by Proteſtants.

SECT. I.

Catholike Doctrine.

THE Catholike Church, (1) *conſidering that no little profit might come to the Church of God, if it were made knowne amongſt all the Latin Editions of the Scriptures which are publiſhed, which were to be houlden for authenticall; decreeth & declareth, that this Old and Vulgar Edition, which by the long vſe of ſo many ages, is approued in the Church, in publicke Lectures, Diſputations, Sermons and Expoſitions, ſhould be houlden for authenticall, & that no man vnder any pretext daze, or preſume to reiect the ſame.* And in the Councell of Baſil it was taught, that (2) *by the* [Church] *the Tranſlation of Hieronme, others omitted, is receyued.* And agayne, (3) *many haue tranſlated the Byble into Latin, whether*

(1) *Concil. Trident. Seſſ. 4. Decret. de Editione & vſu ſacrorum Librorum.*

(2) *Orat. de punitione peccat. publ.*

(3) *Orat. Iom. de Ragufio.*

ther from the Hebrew or the Greeke, yet the Translation of our onely most glorious Hierome, by the authority of the Church, is preferred. And the same is (4) still the constant Doctrine of the Catholike Church.

(4) Bellar. de verbo Dei l. 2. c. 10. Rhem. Test. in the Preface.

Points Disputable.

Some (5) Catholike writers teach, that the Iewes in hatred of Christian Religion, did purposely corrupt and deprave many places of Scriptures. Others (6) thinke that the Scriptures written in the Hebrew, were not generally corrupted by the meames and malice of the Iewes: neyther yet, that they are altogeather perfect and pure, but haue in them certayne errours, which haue crept in, partly by negligence, partly by ignorance of the Printers; which yet are not of such moment, but that in those things which belong to fayth and manners, the sacred Scriptures integrity, may not be thought to be wanting. And this is much more probable.

(5) See Morton Apolog. par. 1. l. 1. c. 6. Iacobus Episcopus Constantinop. Præfat. in Psalmos. Canus de locis Theolog. l. 2. c. 13.

(6) Driedo l. 2. de Eccl. dogm. c. 1. Bel. de verb. Dei, l. 2. c. 2. §. His igitur.

Some (7) deny the Greeke Coppies to be most pure fountaines: but others affirme that the Greeke Copy which now is extant in the Church, to be the selfe same, which the Greeke Church vsed in the tyme of S. Hierome, and long before euen vnto the tymes of the Apostles. Some (8) teach that our vulgar Edition was S. Hieromes Translation, but others deny it. Some (9) (as D. Morton reporteth) thinke, that there are therein some errours, through the ignorance or negligence of the Translatour: but others thinke that there is not any errour of weight therein.

(7) See Mort. Apol. part. 2. l. 2. c. 6.

(8) See Mort. Apol. par. 2. l. 1. c. 8.

(9) Ibid. l. 1. c. 11.

Protestants vntruthes.

Caluin (10) auoucheth, that the Fathers of the Tridentine Councell decreed, that such were not to be heard as produced liquor out of the fountayne it selfe. But no such thing is to be seene in the Councell. He also affirmeth, (11) that there are not 3. verses togeather in the Vulgar Edition, which are not stayned with some foule Corruption. And

(10) Antidot. in Sess. 4. Conc. Trid.

(11) Ibid.

And yet himſelfe vndertaking to diſcouer the Corruptions of the Pſalter, doth not obſerue ſo much as one in the firſt Pſalme: ſo vnmindfull is this Lyar.

Chemnitius forgeth, (12) that in the *Index Librorum prohibitorum*, publiſhed by Paul the fourth, all Editions of the Bible, euen of the Old Interpreter, are condemned: wheras only ſuch are there condemned, as were eyther made by Heretickes, or ſuſpected Printers. He alſo pretendeth, that therfore the Vulgar Edition is made authenticall by the Councell, becauſe it maketh wholly for Popiſh doctrine. But in this, beſides impudency, he theweth Imprudence, for Prot. (13) do acknowledge the vulgar Edition to be moſt ancient, and moſt ſyncere: and ſo then conſequently are our Catholicke Doctrines moſt ancient and ſyncere.

(12) *Exam. Conc. Trid. Seſſ. 4.*

(13) See hereafter in the 2. Section.

Proteſtant Doctrine.

Although there be many Tranſlations of the Bible made by Proteſtants, yet, *we account* (ſayth D. Whitaker(14) *no Edition to be authenticall, but only the Hebrew in the Old, and the Greeke in the New Teſtament.* And as for the Vulgar Latine Edition, it is, in Whitakers opinion, (15) *an old rotten Edition &c. full of faults, errors, and Corruptions.* (16) *then which nothing can be more faulty or diſteyned:* and, *of all* (17) *others moſt corrupt.* Yea (18) *I thinke* (ſaith White) *the Sunne neuer ſaw any thing more defectiue and maymed, then the Vulgar Latine.* But I ſhall ſhortly ſhew, that euen in the ſunſhyne of the Reformed Ghoſpell, there are many Proteſtants Tranſlations publiſhed, moſt defectiue, and maymed, and the vulgar Latine Tranſlation for ſincerity, confeſſedly to be preferred before them all.

(14) *De ſacra Scrip. Contr. 1. q. 2. pa. 128. Piſcator volum. Theſium Theolo. p. 34.*

(15) Whitak. in his Anſwere to Reinolds. Pref. p. 25. 26.

(16) *De ſacra Scrip. q. 5. c. 11. p. 543.*

(17) Anſwere to Reinolds. p. 213. 218.

(18) Way to the Church. p. 19.

Proteſtant Errours.

Swinglians, (19) Anabaptiſts, and Caluiniſts agree in this, that they will haue no Tranſlation of the Bible to be authenticall: and they thinke it vniuſt, that the Church ſhould be tyed to any one Tranſlation.

(19) *Præfat. Figurinæ Editionis Bil.*

SECT.

SECT. II.

It is proued by ſundry Arguments, that the Vulgar Latin Tranſlation of the Bible, is to be preferred before all Tranſlations made by Proteſtants.

TO make triall with M. Whitaker, and that by Iuron of his owne packe, whether our Vulgar Edition of the Bible, for putity and ſincerity, be not much to be preferred before any Edition Proteſtant that euer was; firſt concerning the Tranſlation of the Bible made by Luther, Swinglius writing vnto him concerning the corruptions therof, ſayth, (1) *Thou doeſt corrupt the word of God, thou art ſeene to be a manifeſt and common Corrupter, and peruerter of the holy Scriptures: how much are we aſhamed of thee, who haue hitherto eſteemed thee beyond all meaſure, & now proue thee to be ſuch a man.* Keckemanus affirmeth likewiſe, that (2) *Luthers Dutch Tranſlation of the old Teſtament, eſpecially of Iob, and the Prophets, hath its blemiſhes, and thoſe no ſmall ones* Some few of Luthers corruptions I will only touch, as where it is ſayd, (3) *There be three which giue Teſtimony in heauen, the Father, the Word, and the holy Ghoſt & theſe three be one:* this being a moſt euident place in proofe of the B. Trinity, is wholy omitted, and left out by Luther in his Dutch Bible. In like manner where it is ſayd, (4) *We account a man to be iuſtifyed by Fayth, without the workes of the Law*; Luther heer tranſlateth *iuſtified by Faith, alone*, ſo adding to the text in maintenance of his errour, the word, *alone*; yet being admoniſhed of this ſo foule a Corruption, he perſiſted willfull, ſaying, (5) *So I will, ſo I command, let my will be inſteed of reaſon &c. Luther will haue it ſo.* And concludeth laſtly, *the word (alone) muſt remayne in my new Teſtament, although all the Papiſts go mad, they ſhall not take it from thence: I am ſorry that I did not alſo adde theſe two wordes, omnibus & omnium, to wit, ſine omnibus operibus omnium legum, without all workes of all Lawes.* Alſo where it is ſayd, (6) *Wherefore Brethren, Labour the more, that by good workes you may make ſure your*

(1) Tom. 3. ad Luther. lib. Sacram. pag. 411. 413.

(2) Syſtem. 8. Theol. l. 2. pa. 188.

(3) 1. Ioh. 5.

(4) Rom. 3. 28.

(5) Tom. 5. Germ. fol. 141. 144.

(6) 2. Pet. 1. 10.

your vocation and Election; Luther here omitteth those words (*by good workes*) which yet are acknowledged to be parcell of the Text by the Protestant (7) Kinnedoncius, & by our English Translations.

(7) Redemption of Mankind. p. 382.

Luther in some requitall to Swinglius, reiecteth the Translations of the Swinglians, terming them in matter of Diuinity, (8) *Fooles, Asses, Antichrists, deceiuers, and of a like vnderstanding*: In so much, that when Froscheuerus the Swinglian Printer of Zurick sent him a Bible translated by the Diuines there, Luther would not receiue the same, but sending it back, reiected it, as witnesse Hospinian (9) and Lauatherus.

(8) See Swinglius Tom. 2. ad Luther. l. de Sacram. f. 388. 389.

(9) *Hist. Sacram. part. als. fol. 183. Lauath. hist. Sacram. f. 32.*

The Tigurine Translation was in like manner so distastfull to other Protestant Diuines, that (10) *The Elector of Saxony, in great anger reiected it &c. and placed Luthers Translation in roome therof*, though you haue seene before how foule it was.

(10) *Hospin. in Concord. Discord f. 238.*

The Translation set forth by Oecolampadius, and the Diuines of Basill, is reproued by Beza, who affirmeth that, (11) *The Basill Translation is in many places wicked, and altogether differing from the mynd of the holy Ghost*

(11) *In Resp. ad Defens. & Resp. Castal.*

The Translation of Castalio (which D. Humfrey affirmeth to be (12) *throughly conferred, examined, and polished*, and which, as Gesnerus (13) saith, *doth far surpasse all the Translations of all men hitherto set forth*, in like commendation wherof other Protestants (14) do agree) is neuertheles condemned by Beza, as being (15) *Sacrilegious, wicked, and Ethnicall*. In so much as Castalio wrote a speciall Treatise in defence of his owne Translation, complaining there in his Preface, and saying, *Some reiect our Latine and French Translations of the Bible, not only as vnlearned, but also as wicked, and differing in many places from the mynd of the holy Ghost*.

(12) *De Rat. Interpret. l. 2. p. 62. 64. 189.*

(13) *In biblioth. Sea. Castal.*

(14) See Castal. Defence p. 236. & Hipperius & Melancton set before Castalios great Bible of 1573.

(15) *In Test. 1556. in Praf. & in Annot. in Mat. 3. & in 2. Cor. 2. & Mat. 4. & Luc. 2. & in*

As Concerning Caluins Translation, that famous Protestant Carolus Molinæus affirmeth, that (16) *Caluin in his Harmony, maketh the text of the Ghospell to leap vp and downe, he vseth violence to the letter of the Ghospell, & besides this, addeth to the Text.*

Touching Beza's Translation, the same Molinæus char-

Act. 8. & 10.

(16) *In ſua Tranſlat. Nou. Teſt. part. 21 fol. 110.*

(17) *In Teſtam. part. 10. 30 40 64. 65. 66. 74. 99. & part. 8 13. 14. 21. 23.*

(18) *Ofiand. cent. 16. p 753.*

(19) *In. def. Tranſlat. p. 170.*

(20) Conference before the K Maieſty pa. 46

(21) *Ibid. p. 47.*

(22) Apology concerning Chriſts deſcending into hel. at D 3d.

(23) A Petition directed to his Maieſty. pa. 76.

(24) *Ib p. 75.*

(25) That Chriſt deſcended into Hel p. 116. 117. 118. 121. 144.

(26) Anſwer to Rainolds p. 855.

chargeth him, that (17) *He actually changeth the Text*, and giueth further ſundry inſtances of his Corruptions. Caſtalio alſo, that (18) *learned Caluiniſt, and moſt skilfull in the tongues*, reprehendeth Beza in a whole booke of this matter, and further ſaith, (19) *I will not note all his Errors* (in Tranſlation) *for that would require a volume ouer great*. All which but confirmeth K. Iames his true and learned Cenſure in (20) *thinking the Geneua Tranſlation to be worſt of all*: And his further affirming, That in the (21) *Marginall notes annexed to the Geneua Tranſlation, ſome are very partiall, vntrue, ſeditious &c.* Agreably to this alſo ſaith M. Parkes to D. Willet, (22) *As for the Geneua Bibles, it is to be wished, that either they may be purged from thoſe manifold errors, which are both in the Text, and in the Margent, or els vtterly prohibited*. Thus far of the confeſſed corruptions in the foraine Proteſtants Tranſlations.

But to come now to our Engliſh ones, the Puritanes complaine vnto his Maieſty, that, (23) *Our Tranſlation of the Pſalmes, compriſed in our Booke of Common Prayer, doth in addition, ſubtraction, and alteration, differ from the truth of the Hebrew in 200. places at the leaſt*. In ſo much, as they reſt doubtfull, (24) *whether a man with a ſafe Conſcience may ſubſcribe therto*. Yea they haue written and publiſhed a ſpeciall Treatiſe entituled, *A Defence of the Miniſters reaſons for refuſall of ſubſcribing*; the whole Argument and ſcope wherof, is only concerning miſtranſlating, and the title vpon the frontiſpice of euery page throughout the Booke, is, *concerning Tranſlations*: Yea wheras it containeth 26. Chapters, the Reader may ſee before the beginning of the Booke, the title of euery ſuch Chapter pointing to the *Miſtranſlatings* there in particular handled.

M. Carlile auoucheth, that the Engliſh Tranſlatours haue (25) *depraued the ſenſe, obſcured the truth, and deceiued the ignorant; that in many places they do detort the Scriptures from the right Senſe, and that they ſhew themſelues to loue darknes more then light, falshood more then truth*; wherunto D. Whitaker hath no better anſwere then to ſay, (26) *what M. Carlile with ſome others hath writtē against ſome places tranſlated in our Bibles, maketh nothing to the purpoſe; I haue not ſaid otherwiſe, but that ſome things may be amended*,

amended, which yet to this day, remaine not amended.

Yea ſundry Miniſters haue not forborne in their great Zeale, to ſignify vnto his Maieſty, that the Engliſh Tranſlation of the Bible, is (27) *A Tranſlation that taketh away from the Text*: that (28) *addeth to the text, and that ſometymes to the changing or obſcuring of the meaning of the holy Ghoſt*: Calling it yet further (29) *A Tranſlation which is abſurd and ſenſeleſſe*, (30) *peruerting in many places the meaning of the holy Ghoſt.*

(27) The Abridgment which the Miniſters of Lincolne Dioceſſe deliuered to his Maieſty p. 11.

(28) *Ib. p.* 11. 12.

(29) *Ib p.* 13.

(30) *Ib p.* 13. 14.

In regard of which *peruerting the meaning of the holy Ghoſt*, Proteſtants of tender Conſcience make great ſcruple to ſubſcribe vnto them: for ſo doth Burges excuſe himſelfe ſaying, (31) *How ſhall I approue vnder my hand, a Tranſlation which hath many omiſsions, many additions, which ſometimes obſcureth, ſometimes peruerteth the ſenſe, being ſometimes ſenſeles, ſometimes contrary.*

(31) Apology ſec. 6. And in Couels Anſwere to Burges p. 93.

Now, in preuention of ſo great an euill, and ſcandall following, Broughton, one of the chiefeſt of the Puritanicall Linguiſts, wrote an Epiſtle to the Lords of the Councell, deſiring them to procure ſpeedily a new Tranſlation: *becauſe that* (quoth he) *which is now in England, is full of Errors.* And in his Aduertiſements of Corruptions, he telleth the *Proteſtant Biſhops, that, their publicke Tranſlation of Scriptures into Engliſh, is ſuch, as that it peruerteth the text of the Old Teſtament in 848 places, and that it cauſeth millions of millions to reiect the New Teſtament, and to runne to eternall flames.* A dreadfull ſaying for all Proteſtant Profeſſors.

Now theſe our Proteſtant Engliſh Tranſlations, being thus confeſſedly *corrupt, abſurd, ſenſles, contrary, and peruerting the meaning of the holy Ghoſt*, had not his Maieſty iuſt cauſe to affirme, that he (32) *could neuer yet ſee a Bible well tranſlated into Engliſh*? From all which then it further enſueth, that our Proteſtant Bibles being thus falſely tranſlated, they can be no certaine and infallible meanes, whereby to decyde Controuerſies in matters of Faith; *Tranſlations* (according to D. Whitaker) (33) *being ſo far forth only the word of God, as they faythfully expreſſe the meaning of the authenticall text.* Which none of them do, but the direct cõtrary is cleerly heere made manifeſt by no weaker proofes, then by their plaine Confeſ-

(32) Conf. before his Maieſty pa. 46.

(33) Anſwere to Rein p. 235.

ſions, to their eternall ſhame, and like ſpirituall ruine to all that follow the ſaid Tranſlations.

Who can now expect, but that Prot. inueighing thus bitterly againſt all their owne Tranſlations, which yet they, and their ſimple followers, do daily read and follow; but that they will make moſt ſerpentine Satyres againſt the Vulgar Latin, which all Catholikes approue? But haue a litle patience, and you ſhall ſee, that as they do thus agree to diſagree in their owne Tranſlations, mutually condemning (as before) ech other: ſo alſo haue they vpon a ſecond and more aduiſed Conſideration, affoarded honourable teſtimony euen of our Vulgar Latin Tranſlation, had from Rome, and (34) approued ſince by Generall Councell: for ſo Beza confeſſeth that, (35) *The Old Interpreter ſeemeth to haue interpreted the holy Bookes with greateſt Religion.* (36) And, *I do imbrace*, ſayth he, *for the moſt part, the Vulgar Edition, and preferre it before all others.* So that with Beza, all Proteſtants Tranſlations, muſt come behind our Vulgar.

(34) See before. ſec 1.
(35) *Annot. in Luc. 1. 1.*
(36) *In Præf. nou. Teſt.*

D. Humfrey confeſſeth that, (37) *The old Interpreter was much addicted to the propriety of words, and that ouer ſcrupulously, which yet, I interpret him to haue done vpon Religion* (or Conſcience) *not vpon ignorance.* Heer is he free from malice and ignorance in tranſlating.

(37) *De ratione Interpret. l. 2. p. 74.*

In regard of which integrity and learning, Molinæus ſignifyeth his like ſpeciall liking thereof ſaying, (38) *I can very hardly depart from the Vulgar and accuſtomed reading, which alſo I am accuſtomed earneſtly to defend:* (39) *Yea I prefer the Vulgar Edition before Eraſmus, Bucer, Bullinger, Brentius, the Tigurine Tranſlation, alſo before Iohn Caluin, and all others.* What could be ſpoken more honourably for our Vulgar?

(38) *In Nou. Teſt. part. 30.*
(39) *In Luc. 17.*

And yet Conradus Pellican (40) (*A man much commended by Bucer, Swinglius, Melanchton, and all famous men about Baſill, Tigure, Berne &c.*) addeth a far higher Commendation, in theſe words, (41) *I fynd the Vulgar Edition of the Pſalter, to agree for the ſenſe, with ſuch dexterity, learning, and fidelity of the Hebrew; that I doubt not but the Greeke and Latin Interpreter, was a man, moſt learned, moſt Godly, and of a Propheticall ſpirit.* Which certaynly are the beſt properties of a good Tranſlatour.

(40) 2. part. of the Def. of the Miniſters. pag. 86.
(41) *In Præf. in Pſalter. Anno 1524.*

Now,

Now, in regard of theſe laudable premiſes, D. Doue giueth wholſome counſayle, ſaying, (42) *We grant it fit, that for vniformity in quotations of places, in Schooles and Pulpits, one Latin Text ſhould be vſed. And we can be contented for the antiquity thereof to preferre that* (to wit the Vulgar) *before all other Latin bookes.*

And if the Antiquity therof may carry with it any good reſpect, D. Couell will tell you, that (43) *It was vſed in the Church 1300. yeares agoe*, and himſelfe doubteth not to (44) *preſer that Tranſlation before others:* In ſo much that whereas the Engliſh Proteſtant Tranſlations, be many and among themſelues diſagreeing; he concludeth, that of all thoſe, (45) *The approued Tranſlation authorized by the Church of England, is that which cometh neereſt to the Vulgar, and is commonly called the Bishops Bible.*

Add laſtly herennto, that S. Hierome by the appointment of Pope Damaſus, was author, or rather Reuiewer, of this our Common Edition: In ſo much, that in his Preface before the new Teſtament dedicated to Pope Damaſus, he ſayth thereof; *You cauſe me to make a New Worke of an old, that I after ſo many Copies of the Scriptures, diſperſed through the world, ſhould ſit, as a certayne Iudge, and determine which of them agree with the true Greeke.* (46) *I haue reſtored the New Teſtament, to the truth of the Greeke, and haue tranſlated the Old according to the Hebrew.* (47) *Truly I will affirme it confidently, and will produce many witneſſes of this worke, that I haue changed nothing from the truth of the Hebrew &c. aske any of the Hebricians, and you ſhall clearly ſee it.*

But peraduenture S. Hierome with ſome Proteſtants, wilbe thought partiall in his owne caſe, let vs therefore ſee S. Auſtines worthy teſtimony of S. Hierome and this Tranſlation. (48) *There was not wanting* (ſayth S. Auguſtine) *in theſe our dayes, Hierome the Prieſt, a man moſt learned, and skilfull in all the three tongues, who not from the Greeke, but from the Hebrew tranſlated the ſame Scriptures into Latin: whoſe learned labour the Iewes yet confeſſe to be true*; yea the truth and due reſpect heerof is ſuch, that D. Whitaker (vpon a more ſober and ſtayed iudgement) doth alter the former vehemency of his ſtyle ſaying, (49) *S. Hierome I reuerence, Damaſus I commend,*

(42) Perſuaſion to Recuſants, p. 16.
(43) Anſw. to Burges p. 94.
(44) Ibid.
(45) Ibid. pa. 91.
(46) *In Catal. fine.* See Eſtius de Verbo Dei. l. 4. c. 9.
(47) *Præf. Iſalt. quæ eſt ep. 134. & in Prologo ad lib. Regum.*
(48) De ciu. Dei, l. 18. c. 43. & ep. 80. ad Hieron. c. 3. See Greg. l. 20. Mor. c. 21. Iſidor. l. 6. Etym. c. 5. 7. & de diuin. officijs. l. 1. c. 12. Beda in Martyrolog. Caſſiod. de inſtit. ca. 12. l. 1. Criſpinus of the Eſtate of the Church. p. 117. Fulke. ag. Rhem. Teſt. in 1. Cor. 14. ſec. 14. pa. 548.
(49) Anſwere

to Reinolds p. 141. *and the workes I confeße to be godly & profitable to the Church.*

From all this I may conclude, that the sacred Scriptures translated by Prot. cannot be to them any certaine Iudge in matters of fayth, seeing all the fayd Translations are confessedly false, corrupt and impious: and further, that in all their Disputes, Pulpits, and Writings, they are bound to follow our Vulgar Edition, seeing themselues prefer it for truth and sincerity, before all others.

SECT. III.

Obiections againſt the Vulgar Translation, answered.

IT is obiected, that we weare rather to haue recourse to the fountaynes of the Hebrew and Greeke, which were written by Prophets and Apostles, who could not erre, wheras the latin Translations are of diuers interpreters, who may erre. Answere. The fountayns or originalls are to be preferred before Translations, when it is certayne that the fountaynes are pure, and not troubled or corrupt; but it is most certayne, that they are in some places corrupted. And it may truly be thought, that as the Latin Church was euer more constant in keeping true fayth, then the Greeke: so it was alwaies more carefull in preseruing the Scriptures from corruption. And though it be true, that an Interpreter may erre, yet in that which the Church hath approued, he hath not erred in any matter of fayth or manners, though some smaller errours of Printers I do not deny.

(1) *Gen. 3.*
(2) *L. 2. de Gen. cont. Manich. c 18. & l. 11 de Genesi ad Literam c 38. Amb. l. de fuga sæculi. c. 7. Chrysost. hom. 17. in Gen. Greg. l. 2. Mor c 38. Beda & alij in hunc locum.*

Chemnitius obiecteth that these words (*Ipsa* (1) *conteret caput tuum*) are corrupted, that thereby we may proue the Intercession of the blessed Virgin Mary: And that insteed thereof, we should read, *Ipsum conteret caput tuum*, seeing it was spoken of the seed, which was Christ, as all auncient writers doe teach. Answ. 1. Some bookes of the Vulgar Edition haue *Ipsa*, and some others *ipse*. 2. Though many Hebrew bookes haue *ipse*, yet there hath not wanted some which haue *ipsa*, and the points being taken away, the Heword may be translated *ipsa*. (2) And, *ipsa*, is read by S. Au-

stine,

ſtine, S. Ambroſe, S. Chryſoſtome, S. Gregory, Bede, and ſundry others. And though the word, *Conteret*, in the Hebrew be of the Maſculine gender, and ſo ſhould relate to *Semen*, which alſo in Hebrew is of the Maſculine gender; yet it is not rare in the (3) Scriptures to haue Pronounes and verbes of the Maſculine gender, to be ioyned with Nownes of the feminine. He likewiſe vrgeth, that in theſe wordes, (4) *Melchiſedech Rex ſalem proferens panem & vinum, erat enim Sacerdos Dei altiſſimi*, the word *obtulit*, and the Coniunction *enim*, are not in the Hebrew, but ſo tranſlated, in proofe of the Sacrifice of the Maſſe. Anſw. The Vulgar Edition hath not *obtulit*, but *protulit*, and the Cõiunction is in the Hebrew equiualently.

(3) *Ruth.* 1. 8. *Eſter.* 2. 20. *Eccleſ.* 22. 5.

(4) *Gen.* 14.

Laſtly, he obiecteth, that in theſe wordes (5) *Miſericordia faciet locum vnicuique ſecundum meritum operum ſuorum*, that the word *merit*, is not in the Greeke, but added to proue the merit of workes. Anſw. Κατὰ ἔργα, doth ſignify in Latin moſt properly, *pro meritis operum*, for the merit of their workes. Such poore ſtuffe do Hereticks fynd agaynſt our Vulgar Tranſlation.

(5) *Eccleſ.* 16.

CHAP.

CHAP. VII.

The true State of the Queſtion, concerning Traditions.

Whether, beſides the ſacred Scriptures, or written word of God, there be not another word of God, not written, which is called Traditions. *And whether their authority be certayne and infallible, in deciding matters of Fayth.*

SECT. I.

Catholike Doctrine.

HAVING hitherto proued, that neyther the Scriptures of themſelues, nor as conferred togeather, nor yet as expounded by the Priuat Spirit, can be our ſole Rule of Fayth, or Iudge of all Controuerſies; It now next followeth, that I ſpeake of the word not written, but deliuered from Chriſt or his Apoſtles, by word of mouth: In which the Catholike Church knowing, that the truth of the Ghoſpell, which was firſt taught by Chriſt, and afterwards by his Apoſtles, (1) *is contayned in the written Bookes, and Traditions not written, which being receyued by*

(1) *Concil. Trident. Decret. de Canon. Scripturis.*

by the Apoſtles from the mouth of Chriſt, or from the Apoſtles themſelues, the holy Ghoſt teaching them, as it were, from hand to hand deliuered, haue come vnto vs: The Church (I ſay) *following the Examples of the Orthodoxall Fathers, receiueth and reuerenceth with like affection of piety, all the Bookes aſwell of the Old Teſtament as the New ſeeing one God is the author of both; as alſo the Traditions belonging both to faith and manners, as taught from the mouth of Chriſt, or from the holy Ghoſt, and by continuall ſucceſſion preſerued in the Catholike Church.* Here the Councell receiueth & reuerenceth, with like piety, the word written, and not written, to wit, Traditions.

The ſecond Councell of Nice decreeth thus, (2) *We confeſſe with one conſent, that we will keep Eccleſiaſticall Traditions, whether by writing or cuſtome, being in force and decreed &c.* Againe, *Theſe things being ſo, going the Kings high way, and continuing in the Doctrine of the holy Fathers, and the Catholike Church, in which the holy Ghoſt dwelleth, obſeruing Traditions we do defyne &c. who ſhall dare to thinke otherwiſe, or teach, or after the Cuſtome of wicked Heretikes to violate Eccleſiaſticall Traditions &c. If they be Biſhops or Clergy men, let them be depoſed, if monkes or laye men, let them be excommunicate &c. If any ſhall not regard the Traditions of the Church being in force, whether by writing or Cuſtome, let him be accurſed.* (2) *Act. 7. p. 636. Tom. 3.*

In the eight Generall Councell it is defyned, that (3) *The great Apoſtle Paul doth clearly admonish vs, To keep the Traditions which we haue receyued, whether by ſpeach, or by the Epiſtle of holy men, who haue formerly shyned.* (3) *Act. 10.*

In the Councell of Sens, it is taught that, (4) *It is dangerous to be in that Error, that nothing is to be thought to be admitted which is not drawne from Scripture: for many things are deriued from Chriſt to poſterity by the hands of the Apoſtles, from mouth to mouth &c. which though they ſeeme not to be expreſly contayned in ſacred Scripture, yet they come to be bouldon without all doubt.* That ſundry things are to be receiued, beliefued, and obſerued by Tradition, which are not expreſly taught by the Scriptures, it is generally acknowledged by all (5) Catholikes. (4) *Decret. 5.* (5) *Bellar. de Verbo Dei l. 4 c. 3. Rhem. Teſt p. 510. in 2. Theſſ. 2.*

Proteſtants Vntruthes.

(6) *Inſtit l. 4. c. 10. §. 19.* Caluin affirmeth, that (6) *The Romiſh maiſters will vrge, that there is not any litle Ceremony with them, which is not to be iudged Apoſtolicall*: but Caluin cannot alledge any one of thoſe maiſters, ſo much as intimating any ſuch thing. Chemnitius auoucheth vs to teach, that (7) God appointed that the Doctrine of Chriſt, and his Apoſtles, ſhould not be written in bookes, but only deliuered by word of mouth: And (8) himſelfe affirmeth, that the Apoſtles were commanded to write. But both theſe are vntrue, and the truth in the meane; for we do not teach that God prohibited the foreſaid writing, for then the Apoſtles and Euangeliſts ſhould haue ſinned in writing: neither can he proue, that God did command it, as ſhall appeare hereafter. Againe, ſpeaking of ſome words in the Conſecration of the Chalice, he ſayth, (9) *Popiſh writers haue noted by what Romane Biſhops they were added.* But this is moſt falſe, for though they haue noted, what other parts of the Canon of the Maſſe were added, and by whom, yet not any one is noted to haue added any thing to the words of Conſecration. Yet further, (10) *If any one ſhall but ſhow himſelfe to doubt, that all the Canon of the Maſſe is from Apoſtolicall Tradition, he is to be accurſed.* But this is groſſe forgery, for though we ſay, that the chiefeſt part of the Canon is from Apoſtolicall Tradition, yet we deny not, but that there is commemoration made of diuers Saintes, who liued aboue 200. yeares after Chriſt.

(7) *Exam. Seſſ. 4. p. 68.*

(8) *Ibid. pag. 185.*

(9) *Ibid. pa. 410.*

(10) *Ibid.*

(11) *L. Theol. Ieſuit. &c.* And againe: (11) *Reader, thou ſhalt obſerue in this place, what difference Ieſuites make betweene the Written Traditions of the Apoſtles, and thoſe which themſelues do inuent vnder the name of the Apoſtles; They ſay, thoſe that are written, are arbitrary (or may be changed at pleaſure) but thoſe that are fayned, to bynd vnder perill of ſaluation.* Who would thinke, that any man ſhould runne the perill of Damnation, for the belying of Ieſuits, not being able to ſhow the leaſt proofe therof.

(12) Way to the true Church. p. 3. Iohn White very wiſely thinketh, that *Traditions* (12) *being once admitted, euery Fryars dreame, and baſe Cuſtome of the Romiſh*

mish Church shalbe thrust vpon you for an Article of Religion necessary to Eternall life. It seemes the poore man thought that Catholikes are as simple as himselfe. Melanchton blushed not to say, (13) *Great bookes are extant, yea whole Libraries containing not one syllable of Christ, of faith in Christ, of good workes for euery mans vocation, but only gathering Traditions.* And (14) *they require their Traditions to be obserued more exactly then the Ghospell.* The (15) *Papists* (sayth M. Rogers) *more cruelly do punish the violators of their owne Traditions and Ordinances, then they do the breakers of Gods Commandements.* But certainly Rogers, and his lying Brethren, wilbe cruelly punished for feygning such Impostures, and broaching such incredible lyes.

(13) L. Concordiæ. p. 188. In Apolog. Art. 15.

(14) Lib. Concor. p. 263. in Apol. de Potest. Ecclesiast.

(15) Def. of the Articles Art. 6. p. 19.

Protestant Doctrine.

The English Church hath decreed, that *the* (16) *holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to Saluation: So that whatsoeuer is not read therin, nor may be proued therby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be beleeued as an Article of the fayth, or be thought requisite or necessary to Saluation.* Heere it teacheth, that nothing is to be beleeued or thought necessary to saluation, which is not proued by Scripture. And now you shall heare what it thinketh of Traditions.

(16) Art. 6.

Whitaker expresly sayth, (17) *We do not respect Traditions not written.* (18) *We do acknowledge* (saith Perkins) *only the written word of God.* According to Caluin, (19) *Nothing is to be beleeued, which is not expressed in Scripture.* Yea, sayth Beza, (20) *Christians do acknowledge no other obiect of that faith, then the written word of God.* But I shewed a litle before how hardly they treated their sole obiect of faith, the written word of God: And I shall shortly make it appeare, that they are enforced to acknowledge another obiect of sayth, euen vnwritten Traditions.

(17) Controu. 1. quæst. 3. c. 10. p. 317.

(18) Reform. Cath. contro. 10. c. 12.

(19) In gratulat. ad Præcentorem. p. 377.

(20) In Rom. 1. 17.

Protestants agree with ancient Hereticks.

The (21) Donatists in their Disputations, vrged only the *Scriptures*, and S. Austine obiected to them *Traditions*, &

(21) Aug. l. de vnitate Eccl. c. 19.

the custome of the Church. For the same Error were the Arrians condemned by S. Epiphanius (22) and S. Austin: the Eunomians by S. Basil: (23) the Nestorians, Eutichians, and others by the 7. (24) Synod; and the Apostolicks by (25) S. Bernard. From such infamous Ancestors are our moderne Sectaries descended, who deny all Traditions, and the word of God not written.

(22) *Hær. 75. Aug. cont. Maximin. l. 1. c. 8. & Vit.*
(23) *L. de Spir. Sancto. c. 27. 29.*
(24) *1 Ch. 2.*
(25) *Hom. 66. in Cantic.*

SECT. II.

It is proued by the Sacred Scriptures, that besides themselues, or the written word, there are certayne Traditions of the Church or word of God, not written, which we are bound likewise to belieue and obserue.

IT is euident, that Moyses, (1) *Who wrote all the words of our Lord*, was (as (2) Perkins, Whitaker, and Zanchius confesse) *the first pen-man of holy Scripture*: And yet before his tyme the Church continued two thousand yeares, onely by Tradition without Scripture: wherby it is euident that during all that tyme before Moyses, the true belieuers were not instructed, nor their differences decyded by Scripture which was not then written, but otherwise by Tradition of the Church of those tymes.

But (3) Perkins and Whitaker do answere heerunto, that, God during all that tyme, supplyed the want of Scriptures by apparitions to the Patriarches. But this is only imagined, for in the written apparitions, no such thing doth appeare: for the Patriarches vnto whome he so appeared before *Moyses* tyme, were (4) *Cain*, at what tyme Abel was so religious, that he (5) *offered of the first begotten of his flocke &c. and our Lord had respect to Abel and to his guifts.* Also *Noe*, (6) who being likewise faythfull, (7) *built an Aultar to our Lord &c. & offred holocausts vpon the Aultar*. Abraham, (8) at what tyme God made or repeated the promise to him, not then instructing him in any point of faith which Abrahã had forgotten, for Abraham then belieued, and (9) *builded an Aultar to*

(1) Exod. 24. 4.
(2) Perk. Reform Cath. p. 133. Whitak. de sacra Scrip. p. 99. 583. 752. Zanch. de sacra Scrip. p. 233.
(3) Reform. Cath. p. 133. Whitak de sacra Scrip. p. 752.
(4) Gen. 14. 6.
(5) Gen. 4. 4.
(6) Gen. 6. 14. & 7. 1. & 8. 25. & 9. 1.
(7) Gen. 8. 20.
(8) Gen. 12. 1. & 13. 14. & 15. 1. & 17. 1. & 18. 13.

our Lord. Isaac, (10) to whom he also rehearsed the forsaid promise, Isaac being then so faithfull, as that (11) *he builded an Aultar, and called vpon the name of our Lord.* Lastly he appeared to Iacob, (12) to whom he renewed the same promise, Iacob being at that tyme so faithfull, as that God then said to him, (13) *I wilbe thy keeper whithersoeuer thou goest.* The Apparitions therfore of God vnto the Patriarches before Moyses tyme, were not to supply the Scriptures want, by instructing them in any Points of their Religion then formerly forgotten, for it appeareth fully by the Premises, that the Patriarches, to whom these Apparitions were made before Moyses tyme, were at the tyme of the said Apparitions, not forgetfull of Gods Law, but faithfull and Zealous therin: And therfore the Apparitions so made to them, were not to instruct them in Doctrine then forgotten, but to signify to them Gods other pleasure: which truth is yet more euident, in that aswell in (14) Moyses tyme, as also after (15) the same, when the Scriptures were extant, God vsed Apparitions, no lesse then before.

After the law was written, it was yet for many yeares lost, during which tyme, yet the Iewes continued true beleiuers, (16) *Helcias the high Priest, said to Saphan the scribe, I haue found the Booke of the Law, in the house of our Lord:* Of which booke (17) Protestants thus say, *This was the Copy which Moyses left them, as appeareth 2. Chron. 34. 14. which either by negligence of the Priests, had been lost, or else by the wickednes of Idolatrous kings, had bene abolished.*

It is likewise certaine, that after the Captiuity, (18) Esdras did either restore the Bookes of Scripture, as being before time lost for many yeares, or else (as some ancient (19) Fathers thinke) did collect and gather the Scriptures, into certaine Volumes, as being then before dispersed, and disordered, or (as D. Cowper (20) thinketh) *scattered and destroyed.*

And it is no lesse certayne, that sundry parts of Scripture are yet to this day wanting, as the *Booke* (21) *of the wars of our Lord:* (22) *The Booke of the Iust:* (23) *The booke of Iehu the sonne of Hanani;* (24) *The Bookes of Semeias the Prophet, and of Addo:* (25) *The Booke which Samuel wrote:* (26) *The words of Nathan*

(9) *Gen.12.7.*
(10) *Gen.26.2.24.*
(12) *Gen.28.25.*
(13) *Gen.28.15.*
(14) *Exod.3.4.& 4.1.& 6.3. Nu.12.4.*
(15) *Ios 1.1.& 4.1.& 7.19. Iudic.2.20.& 7.1.& 10 10.& 20 31.& 1.Reg.3 10. 17.& 8 7.& 14.10.& 16.1.& 21.4.& 2. Reg.2.1.& 7.4.& 3. Re. 3.3.& 9.2.*
(16) *4. Reg. 22.8.*
(17) Marginall notes of the English Bible of 1578. in the *2. Reg.22.8.* And Sparke in his Answ. to Albin. pa. 50.
(18) *4. Esdras 14.22.* See *Irenæus l.3.c. 25. Tertul. de habit. mul.*
(19) *Chrisost.*

than the Prophet: the Bookes of Abias the Silonite: the vision of Addo, besides many Parables and verses of Salomon, for he spake (27) three thousand Parables; and his songs were a thousand and tyne. It is also certayne, that (28) S. Paul writ an epistle to the *Laodiceans*, and peraduenture another (29) to the *Corinthians*. Whereof Caluin vpon these words, (30) *I wrote to you in an Epistle*, saith (31) *This Epistle is not extant at this day, and no doubt, but that many others haue perished. But it suffiseth, that there remayne to vs, those which the Lord foresaw to suffice* And Luther vpon these words, (32) *At Salamana was destroyed by his house that tooke vengeance on Baal in the day of battell &c.* teacheth that, (33) *This History is no where else extant in the Scriptures, and many such like things haue happened which are not written; as that which Iudas hath in his Epistle of Michael contending with Sathan for Moyses his body.* Mention also is made in the Epistle of Iude, (34) *of Enoch his Prophecy*, which yet is not to be read in any other part of the Scripture: as neither the names of *Iannes & Mambres* the Egyptian Magicians, but only in (35) S. Paul.

This losse and want of these Scriptures, is a thing so euident, that Zanchius confesseth that, (36) *There were other Bookes inspired by God &c. of which we haue most certayne Testimonies in the Scriptures, but they haue perished, especially at the burning of the Temple, and the destruction of the Citty, when the people were taken into Babilon: those that are wanting, are the Booke of the warres of our Lord, the Booke of the Iust, the Booke of Nathan the Prophet, the wordes of Abias the Silonite, the visions of Addo, many Prouerbs and verses of Salomon.* Agreably whereunto sayth Whitaker, (37) *we grant somethings now to be wanting, which long since were in the Canon of Scriptures.* And according to Willet, (38) *It is not to be doubted, but that some part of the Canonicall Scripture is lost.* All this notwithstanding, such is the ignorant bouldnesse of D. Morton, that he denyeth (39) *Any Canonicall Booke of the Old Testament, or that Epistle of the New Testament to the Laodiceans, to haue perished.*

But now from these cleere and confessed Premisses, I may strongly argue, that if the Church and true fayth haue for many yeares been preserued, before any Scripture was written, and after when it was lost, and yet to this day we haue

ep. ad Heb. hom. 8. Theodoret. Praf. in in Psalmos.
(20) Chronicle fol. 50.
(21) *Num.* 21. 14.
(22) *Iosue* 10. 13. & 2. Reg. 1. 18.
(23) 2. Paral. 20. 34.
(24) 2. Paral 32. 15.
(25) 1. Reg. 20. 25.
(26) 2. Paral. 9. 29. & see 2. Par. 26. 23. & 2. Par. 33. 19.
(27) 3. Reg. 4. 32.
(28) *Col.* 4. 16.
(29) 2. Co. 5. 9.
(30) 1. Co. 5. 9.
(31) in 2. Cor. 5.
(32) Ose 10. 14.
(33) In Ose. 10.
(34) *Ver.* 14.
(35) 2. Tim. 3. 8.
(36) *De sacra Script. p.* 117.
(37) *De sacra Script. p.* 393.
(38) Synop. 1. Controu. q.

haue nor the entyre and full Canon of the Bible, but ſtill many bookes are wanting; then it euidently followeth, that by Tradition true fayth and Religion hath bene taught and preſerued; and the written word, neyther is, or can be our ſole and perfect Rule of fayth, ſeeing we haue not the whole Canon thereof. And I will ſuppoſe for the preſent, that none wilbe ſo abſurd as to affirme, that any one Booke, the Apocalyps for Example, is a ſufficient ſquare or Rule of all our fayth. And if any one ſhould be ſo mad, as to affirme it, then muſt I demaund, what part that is, and why that, rather then another? To which demaund the beſt anſwere wilbe his deepeſt ſilence; and ſo the whole Canon of the Scripture cannot be the ſole and perfect Rule of fayth, ſeeing the whole Canon is not extant, neyther will any one parcell be aſſigned, which contayneth all matter of faith.

4.p.21.18. (39) *Apol. pars 2.l.2.c. 14.*

Perkins and Hoſpinian perceiuing how conuincing this was in proofe of Traditions, thought it ſtill better, though ouer bouldly, yet plainly to deny, that any Scripture was loſt: *I take it to be a truth* (ſayth (40) Perkins) *though ſome thinke otherwiſe, that no part of the Canon is loſt &c. Againe to hould that any Bookes of Scripture ſhould be loſt, calls into queſtion Gods prouidence*: But this being directly contrary to the former Scriptures, and to the Iudgement of other more learned Proteſtants, I omit all further Confutation thereof.

(40) *Reform. Cath p.145. Hoſpinian Hiſt Sacram. p.463.464.*

And will only adde, that ſo many bookes thus periſhed, being all of them diuine, and inſpired by the holy Ghoſt, were not ſuperfluous or leſſe neceſſary, then theſe other parcells which we haue, and therefore though theſe which are extant, be very profitable, yet they are not abſolutely neceſſary, no more then thoſe that haue periſhed; wherefore it is the word which is placed in the mouthes of Biſhops & Prieſts, which ſhall neuer periſh. (41) *The word of our Lord remayneth for euer, and this is the word which is Euangelized among you.* Agreable to this are the ancient Prophecies, (42) *The lips of the Prieſt ſhall keep knowledge, and the Law they ſhall require of his mouth, becauſe he is the Angell of our Lord.* (43) And, *this is my Couenant with them, ſayth our Lord: my Spirit that is in thee, and my words that I haue put in thy mouth, ſhall not depart out of thy mouth, and*

(41) *1.Pet.1.25.* (42) *Malach. 2.7.* (43) *Iſa.59.21.*

and out of the mouth of thy ſeed, and out of the mouth of thy ſeeds ſeed, ſayth our Lord, from this preſent and for euer; which certaynty of continuance, we no where find to be promiſed to the written word.

But to proceed yet further, though Moyſes writ the Law, yet ſomethings did he deliuer by Tradition, whereof not obſcure mention is made in the fourth Booke of Eſdras, where it is ſayd in the perſon of God, touching Moyſes, (44) *I brought him vpon Mount Sina, and held him with me many dayes, &c. And I commanded him ſaying, Theſe words thou ſhalt publish abroad, and theſe thou ſhalt hyde.* And to omit, that theſe truths following, were not found written in the Old Teſtamẽt, but continued by Tradition, *the miraculous Pond vpon Probatica* at Hieruſalem, recorded by S. Iohn. (45) *the prayer of Elias concerning rayne*, whereof (46) S. Iames ſpeaketh: *The altercation betweene S. Michaell and the deuill* about Moyſes his body, which (47) S. Iude mentioneth: as alſo that *Iannes & Mambres* reſiſted Moyſes, whereof (48) S. Paul writeth: But I ſay, to omit all theſe, we find it contayned in the Old Teſtament, that in remedy of Originall ſinne, *Circumciſion* was ordained, only for the Male Children of the Iewes, and that not before the eight day, whereof it is ſayd, (49) *An Infant of eight dayes ſhalbe Circumciſed among you, all male kind in your Generations &c. The male, whoſe fleſh of his prepuce, ſhall not be circiſed, that ſoule ſhalbe deſtroyed out of his people, becauſe he hath broken my Couenant*: But what meanes or remedy God vſed herein, eyther with male Children dying before the eight day, with women, or with the Gentile believers, we fynd it not expreſſed in the Scriptures; and yet the knowledge heereof was neceſſary to Saluation.

(44) C. 14. 4. 6. 16. See *Orig ho. 5. in Numeros, Hilar in Pſalm 2. Euſeb. hiſt. l. 7. c. 28. & l. 4. c. 21.*
(45) C 5. 2.
(46) C. 5 17.
(47) *Ver. 9.*
(48) 2. Tim. 3. 8.
(49) *Gen. 17. 12. 14.*

And whereas D. Whitaker would euade in behalfe of women, only by affirming that in reſpect of their remedy from *Originall ſinne*, the (50) *vnmarryed* (women) *did pertayne to their Parents, and the marryed to their husbands*, being as it were circumciſed in them; this is barely affirmed, not proued by any place of the Old Teſtament, and therefore indeed it impugneth D. Whitaker himſelfe, and other Proteſtants, who teach that all matters of Saluation are taught in

(50) *De ſacra Scrip. q. 6 fol. 598.*

in Scripture. Secondly, this nothing helpeth the Male Children dying before the eight day, or the Gentile believers. And thirdly if the women vnmarryed had their remedy herein by their Circumcised Fathers, what need they further remedy, when afterwards they were marryed by their husbands? So impertinent, wanting, and absurd is this Euasion of D. Whitaker.

From Moyses tyme vntill Christ, when the Scriptures were extant, they were yet reserued only with the Iewes, & yet neuertheless there were many true believers in other (51) Nations, as with *Iob his friends*, and others. Yea the Iewes themselues who had the Scriptures did notwithstanding depend especially vpon the Tradition of their fore-Fathers, accordingly as is said: (52) *Remember the old dayes, thinke vpon euery Generation: Aske thy Father and he will declare to thee: the Elders and they will tell thee: (53) aske the old generation & search diligently the memory of the Fathers, for we are as but yesterday &c. and they shall teach thee &c.* (54) *Let not the narration of the ancient escape thee, for they learned of their Fathers: because of them thou shalt learne vnderstanding &c.* So euident it is, that during the Old Testament, both Iewes and Gentiles believed many things only by Tradition.

To come now to the New Testament, we fynd that Christ our Sauiour intended to haue all things preached, & therin gaue speciall Commandemet to his Apostles, saying, (55) *Teach yee all Nations, baptizing them and teaching them to obserue all things whatsoeuer I haue commanded you.* And (56) *going into the whole world preach the Ghospell to all Creatures.* But that he intended to haue all things written, we fynd not: for had his intention herein been the like, it would haue appeared in the Scriptures by his like Commandement, which it no where doth. Secondly had our Sauiour intended to haue all things written, & so, not the Church, but the Scriptures to be the only Rule of faith, then doubtles would he haue left certaine direction and knowledge which had bene the Scriptures, and not haue left it to the Tradition and Iudgment of his Church, as shalbe (57) proued hereafter.

And though Chemnitius (58) obiecteth against this, that

(51) See *Aug. de Ciu. l. 18. c. 47. de peccat. Orig. l. 2. c. 24. l. 2. de Praedest. Sanct. c. 9.*
(52) *Deut. 32. 7.*
(53) *Iob. 8. 8.*
(54) *Ecclesiastic. 8. 11.*
(55) *Mat. 28. 19.*
(56) *Mar. 16. 15.*
(57) See hereafter sect. 4.
(58) *Exam. part. 1. f. 42.*

Christ commanded S. *Iohn to write a Booke?* Yet this is answered by these words in the same place, (59) *That which thou seest, write in a booke, to wit*, his *Reuelations*, which neyther do containe all points of fayth, whereof the now Question is, as also are so obscure and mysticall, that according to Eusebius, (60) *no man can vnderstand them.*

(59) *Apoc. 1. 11.*

(60) *Prolog. in Apoc.*

In like sort though the Apostles according to Christs command preached all needfull points of fayth, yet they neuer intended to set downe in writing all such points; for whereas they preached the Ghospell without expectation of any occasion, they did not yet vndertake to write, but when they were prouoked thereto by some vrgent cause, accordingly as M. Hooker affirmeth, that, (61) *The seuerall Bookes of Scripture are written vpon some seuerall occasion, and particular purpose &c.* So did S. Matthew at his departure from the Hebrewes, write his Ghospell to them, (62) *prouoked thereunto* (as Eusebius sayth) *by necessary necessity.* So likewise did S. Marke write his Ghospell vrged thereto by the earnest (63) *request of the Romans.* And whereas many (as may be gathered from (64) S. Luke and Eusebius) did presume to write of our Sauiour, and his actions, not hauing perfect notice therof, vpon this occasion did S. Luke write his Ghospell, the which labour he did especially (65) vndertake for Theophilus. In like manner did (66) S. Iohn preach the Ghospell till his last age without Scripture, & did (as S. (67) Hierome affirmeth) take occasion to write, by reason of the Ebionites, whose heresy was then arysing. S. Paul also did write his Epistles vpon like speciall occasions, as that to the Romanes, and the other to the Galathians, (68) against such as thought Circumcision needfull (that opinion being then an errour of those (69) beginning tymes.) The other Epistles of S. Peter, Iames, Iohn, and Iude, were written against certayne Heretickes, who misvnderstanding S. Paul (as S. Peter (70) noteth of some) did thereupon teach, that *fayth only without workes sufficed to saluation*: Of which very poynt S. Austine sayth, (71) *Because this opinion was then begun, other Apostolicall Epistles of Peter, Iohn, Iames, Iude, do chiefly direct their intention against it, that they might strongly confirme Fayth*

(61) *Eccl. Polit. 1 sec. 25. p. 87.*

(62) *Hist. lib. 6. c. 14.*

(63) *Euseb. Hist. l. 2. c. 14.*

(64) *Luc. 1. 1. Euseb. Hist. lib. 6. c. 18.*

(65) *Luc. 1. 3. 4.*

(66) *Euseb. his. l. 3. c. 28.*

(67) *De Scriptoribus Ecclesiast.*

(68) See the Argument vpon the Epistle to the Galathians in the Engl. Bible of 1576.

(69) *Act. 15. 1.*

(70) *2. Pet. 3. 16.*

(71) *De fide & operibus. c. 24.*

without workes to profit nothing. And a little before, he likewise writeth that, *Even in the Apostles time, certayne obscure sayings of Paul the Apostle not being vnderstood, some thought that he affirmed the same*. By all which it is euident, that the Apostles and Euangelistes, did write their bookes, not by any commaund from Christ, but vpon some or other accidentall occasion vrging them thereto.

We do not read that the Apostles were sent to *write*, but to *preach*, and so accordingly all of them preached, whereas the greater part of them writ nothing at all. And of those which did write, some testify, that their intent in writing, was not to set downe the Law, (72) but onely to exhort, comfort and admonish them, to whome they writ of such things, as they had formerly taught them. And S. Iohn expressely denyeth, that he hath comprehended in writing all such things, as were worthy wryting, and that he will deliuer the rest by word of mouth, (73) *Hauing more things to write vnto you, I would not by paper and inke: for I hope that I shall be with you, and speake mouth to mouth, that your ioy may be full*. Now that these things which the Apostles did not write, but teach by word of mouth were matters also of waight and belonging to fayth, S. Paul assureth vs in those words, (74) *Night and day more abundantly praying, that we may see your face, and may accomplish those things that want of your fayth*. So euident it is, that the Apostles besides their writings, did preach other things which were wanting to their fayth.

(72) Rom. 15.14. 15.2. Pet.1.13. 15.2. Pet.3.2.

(73) 2. Io. ver. 12. 3. Io. ver. 13.14.

(74) 1. Thess. 3.10.

This much yet further appeareth by order of their writings, for the Euangelists did not purposely set downe in their Ghospels principles of fayth, but penned only historically, and by way of Narration, a briefe abstract of our Saviours Acts, especially those wherein were fulfilled the Prophecies foretold of him. And so also did S. Luke accordingly set downe in his Actes, the Ecclesiastical History of those tymes. In like manner the Apostles in their Epistles, do but treat *obiter* of matters of fayth, discoursing thereof, as also of other matters nothing pertayning to fayth, casually and as occasion is ministred, which occasion is for the most part but particular, concerning only but sometymes a special

people; as the Romanes, Corinthians &c. sometimes but priuat persons, as Titus, Timothy &c. And (which is most worthy of obseruation) all their Epistles be written to such persons only as were then before conuerted to the fayth; which thing was done, as Swinglius acknowledgeth, not so much to instruct, as to confirme. His words are; (75) *In the tymes of the Apostles, there was not any of the new Testament written, but the Apostles as yet taught by word of mouth: Epistles were sent to and fro, not so much to instruct, as to confirme*, in the fayth before receiued. Now had the Apostles intentiō in writing beene such, & so full as it was in their preaching, then like as they preached generally to all, so likewise their writings would haue been written indifferently for all.

(75) Tom. 2. l. de Eccles. fol. 43.

Agayne, if the intention or occasion of the Apostles had beene to write all needfull points of faith, then doubtles like as our Saniour did, (76) *after his passion appeared to them for fourty dayes speaking of the Kingdome of God*, & as then (77) instructing them in all needfull points of fayth; so also they all, or some one of them, would in like manner haue imployed his labour, to haue set downe the same specially in writing, and being assisted by the holy Ghost, would accordingly haue performed the same: Nay it followeth heerupon, that euery of them who did write, (this being according to Protestants the occasion of his writing) should haue performed the same. And so by this reason S. Iudes Epistle, for example, onely should be sufficient.

(76) Act. 1 3.
(77) See Clement. apud Euseb. l. 2. c. 1. & Cent. 1. l. 2. c. 10. Col. 581. Fulke against Rhem. Test. in Apoc. c. 2. fol. 463.

And wheras D. Whitaker answereth heerto, that the Apostles (78) *knew that God would so gouerne their wits and hands, that those whom it behoued should write, & should write so much as should suffice, and that in time they should do all things*; & so, that they had a generall intētion or notice, that what was wanting in one mans writings, should be supplyed in another: this neyther doth satisfy, for the Apostles being dispersed into sundry Nations, did not for the most, specially at the tyme of their writing, so much as know one of others writings, much lesse then did or could they write, with intention to supply what was wanting in others writings: which appeareth yet more fully, in that one and the same writer, as name-

(78) De sacra Script. q. 2. p. 397.

ly

ly S. Paul, in ſundry of his Epiſtles, doth handle for the moſt part, one and the ſame matter, as in his Epiſtle to the Romanes, and the other to the Galathians: and alſo the Euangeliſts do in like manner, for the moſt part, diſcourſe and make mention of ſundry matters; which are in others of them fully ſet downe: which their doing were ſuperfluous, had their occaſion of writing beene to ſupply what was wanting in others. Vpon all which premiſes I do conclude, that the holy Ghoſt did not intend or command, that the Apoſtles and Euangeliſts ſhould write all needfull points of fayth, ſeeing none, or all of them did euer performe the ſame.

But what more conuincing for Traditions, then thoſe expreſſe words of S. Paul, *Therfore* (79) *Brethren ſtand, and hould the Traditions which you haue learned, whether it be by word, or our Epiſtle*; ſo plainly affirming that ſome things be taught by word, others by writing. This place is ſo powerfull, that it enforceth Proteſtants to very deſperate ſhifts.

(79) 2. Theſſ. 2. 15

D. Reinolds anſwereth, that, (80) *by the word ſpeach* (or word) *S. Paul comprehendeth other Scriptures*, and ſo confoundeth and maketh all one, *ſpeaking* and *writing*, which is to make S. Paul to ſpeake moſt abſurdly. But theſe not ſatisfying, D. Reinolds (81) anſwereth further, that though the Apoſtle heere mentioneth *Traditions*, deliuered to the Theſſalonians by *word*, yet thoſe *Traditions* alſo were (though vnwritten to them yet) contayned elſwhere in the Scriptures: for it appeareth in the (82) Acts, where the hiſtory is written, and thoſe Traditions ſet downe, that S. Paul preached to the Theſſalonians, that, *it behoued Chriſt to ſuffer, and to ryſe againe*, and that he is *Ieſus Chriſt* whom the Apoſtle preached. Now, this Doctrine being the Tradition, which he meant in the place obiected, and which he deliuered to them by word, is manifeſtly contayned, though not in his ſaid Epiſtle to the Theſſalonians, yet in other Scriptures. But the weaknes of this Anſwere appeareth many wayes, for firſt it is without colour, vnleſſe it could be proued, that the Apoſtle by thoſe Traditions deliuered by word, did vnderſtand only that doctrine, which is here alleadged

(80) Def. of the Poſit. P. 315.

(81) Conference fol. 450. 689.

(82) C. 17. 3.

out of the Actes, which D. Reinolds neither doth, nor could proue. Secondly the Doctrine alleadged out of the Actes, was before written by him to the Theſſalonians themſelues in his firſt Epiſtle, wherin he inſtructeth them touching our Sauiour, that he is (83) *Iesus Christ*, and that *Iesus was killed, and rayſed vp from the dead*, and therfore the Apoſtle ſpeaking in the place by me obiected of Traditiõs deliuered by word, cánot be thought to meane therby this only doctrine which he deliuered to the ſame perſons before by writing; his words implying ſo plaine diuerſity of Traditions, which he taught them either by word or writing. Thirdly the foreſaid anſwere is without all probability, vnleſſe it can be ſhewed that all the doctrine which S. Paul taught the Theſſalonians, is wholly expreſſed in that place of the Actes; for if all be not there written, how then can it from thence be knowne, what thoſe Traditions deliuered by word are, wherof the Apoſtle ſpeaketh in his ſaid Epiſtle to the Theſſalonians. And that all ſuch Doctrine as S. Paul did teach the Theſſalonians, ſhould be ſet downe in that place of the Actes, it cannot be ſhewed; yea the contrary is euident, for as he taught them by writing many things concerning *Antichriſt*, (84) the *Iudgment* (85) *day*, and other matters (86) not mentioned in that ſaid place of the Actes: ſo doubtleſſe he did preach by word no leſſe to them, then he did to his other hearers, (87) *all the Counſell of God, and concealed from them* (88) *nothing that was profitable, but preached it to them*; all which cannot be found expreſſed in that place of the Actes. Fourthly the Apoſtle did by theſe Traditions of his, deliuered either by word or writing, vnderſtand his vniuerſall doctrine, concerning all needfull pointes of faith; but that all this was written in S. Paules tyme, much leſſe at the tyme of his writing this his Epiſtle to the Theſſalonians, cannot be proued; but as the Contrary is certaine, that many parts of the New Teſtament were written after this Epiſtle: from whence it followeth, that the Apoſtle by the foreſaid words, did refer the Theſſalonians to be inſtructed, not only by the Scriptures, becauſe they were not all then extant, but alſo by the Tradition of Doctrine, which was then

(83) 1. Theſſ. 2. 15. 19.

(84) 2. Theſſ. 2.5.

(85) Ib. ver. 2.3.

(86) Ib. 2.5.6.

(87) Act. 20. 27.

(88) Act. 20. 20.

vnwritten. This truth is ſo cleere, that it is confeſſed by D. Whitaker, ſaying; (89) *How is it like, if theſe things were ſo fully written, that the Apoſtle ſhould make any mention of Traditions: but becauſe he perceiued that theſe things, were not yet written, he therefore marueth the Theſſalonians, that theſe Traditions were to be kept.* And the ſame is acknowledged by (90) M. Perkins: ſo many wayes, and ſo confeſſedly is this Euaſion inſufficient againſt ſo cleere a Text of Scripture.

(89) *De ſacra Script. q. 6. fol. 234.*

(90) *Reform. Cath. p. 102.*

Wherfore D. Whitaker and M. Perkins, perceiuing the inſufficiency of Reinolds replye, do further anſwere, that though theſe Traditions deliuered them by word, were at that tyme vnwritten, that yet they were afterwards written, and are now to be found in the Scriptures: But this they barely ſay without all proofe; and yet admitting ſo much, hereby is granted, that S. Paul did referre the Theſſalonians, for that tyme, to Tradition, euen *in things neceſſary*, as D. Whitaker (91) and M. Perkins are forced to confeſſe. But if *in things neceſſary*, then idle is that other Euaſion related by D. Whitaker, ſaying; (92) *Others thinke Paul to ſpeake of certaine externall things and Ceremonies, not of very great moment:* But this neither can be proued, but is onely nakedly affirmed.

(91) *Vbi ſupra.*

(92) *Controu. 1. q. 6. c. 10.*

I may alſo add hereunto that of S. Iohn, (93) *Hauing more things to write vnto you, I would not impart them by paper and inke.* Alſo of S. Paul, (94) *The reſt I will diſpoſe when I come.* And ſpeaking of Chriſtes Prieſthood, he ſayth, (95) *Of whom I haue great ſpeach, and inexplicable to vtter.* And to Timothy, (96) *O Timothy keep the Depoſitum.* To the Corinthians, (97) *I praiſe you Brethren, that in all things you be mindfull of me, and as I haue deliuered vnto you, you keep my Precepts,* or *Traditions* according to the Greeke. Yea he tearmeth the Corinthians *The Epiſtle of Chriſt written (98) not with Inke, but with the Spirit of the liuing God, not in Tables of ſtone, but in the tables Carnall of the hart.* According to which, the Holy Ghoſt prophecieth of the Newe Teſtament by Hieremy, ſaying, (99) *I will put my Law into their bowels, and in their harts will I write it.* So manifeſt it is, that the Apoſtles deliuered many things by word and not by writing.

(93) *Ep. 2. ver. 12.*

(94) *1. Cor. 11. 34.*

(95) *Heb. 5. 11.*

(96) *1. Tim. c. 6. 20.*

(97) *1. Cor. 11. 2.*

(98) *2. Cor. 3. 3.*

(99) *Hier. 31. 33.*

Proteſtants perceiuing the former Scriptures to be ſo plaine

playne, that none of the foresayd answers do any thing satisfy, they wage a new warre against the Scriptures themselues, tearing the same in peeces, by many and seuerall corruptions. As first Beza (a man in this kind most expert & audacious) in his (100) Translation, changeth in S. Paules words, 2. Thess. 2. 15. the disiunctiue particle, *siue* (*Whether*) into the Cõiunctiue, *tum* (*both*) *in this manner*; *Hold the Traditions which you are taught, both by word, as also by our Epistle.* And in another (101) Edition he likewise trãslateth the Text thus, *Hold the Doctrine deliuered which you are taught, & per sermonem, & per Epistolam, both by speach and Epistle.* Where for *Traditions*, he putteth *Doctrine deliuered*, which word *Doctrine*, is his own addition, which he maketh also in the singular number, whereas the true word *Traditions*, is both in Greeke and Latin in the plurall: and he also changeth *Whether*, into *and*, whereas between those two wordes, there is no lesse difference then between Beza, and an honest man. But such is the hatred of other Prot. besides Beza against *Traditions*, that whersoeuer the Scripture speaketh agaynst certayne *Traditions* of the Iewes, partly friuolous, partly repugnant to the Law of God; there all the English Translations follow the (102) Greeke exactly, neuer omitting this word Tradition: but where it speaketh in commendatiõ of *Traditions*, to wit such as the Apostles deliuered to the Church; there none follow the Greeke, which is the selfesame word. For example thus they translate, (103) *Why do thy Disciples transgresse the Traditions of the Elders?* And agayne, *why do you also transgresse the Cõmandements of God by your Tradition?* And againe, *you haue made frustrate the Commandement of God, for your Traditions.* Heeres stil the word *Tradition*. But now cõcerning good *Traditions*, the Apostle by the selfesame word, both in Greeke & Latine, sayth thus, *Therfore* (104) *Brethren stand and hold fast the Traditions which you haue learned, either by word, or by our Epistle.* And againe, *Withdraw* (105) *your selues from euery Brother walking inordinatly, and not according to the Traditions which they haue receyued of vs.* And againe according to the Greeke, (106) *I praise you Brethren that in all things you are mindfull of me, and as I haue deliuered vnto you, you keep my Traditions*, κατὰς παραδόσεις

(100) Of Anno 1598. And see him in Whitaker. Controu 1. q 6 c. 10.

(101) *Apud Tremelium.*

(102) παραδόσεις.

(103) *Mat. 15. 2. 3.* παραδόσιν.

(104) 2. Thess. 2. 15 παραδόσεις.

(105) 2. Thess 3. 6.

(106) 1. Cor. 11. 2.

τὰς παραδόσεις κατέχετε. But in all theſe places inſteed of *Traditions* they tranſlate either, *ordinances*, *inſtructions*, *preachings*, *inſtitutions*, or the like. And Beza as before, (107) *traditam doctrinam*, putting the Singular number for the Plurall, and adding, *Doctrine*, of his owne. Yea they vſe the word *Tradition*, when it may tend to the diſcredit therof, it not being in the Greeke Text, (108) as, *Why as though living in the world are yee led with Traditions?* Or as the Tranſlation of Anno 1579. hath, *Why, are yee burdened with Traditions?* And yet a little before, (109) they tranſlate δόγματα, *ordinances*, *decrees*: and therfore why not now τί δογματίζεσθε, *quid decernitis, why do you ordayne or decree, or why are you led with decrees?* their Tranſlation cannot be iuſtifyed, either by Scriptures, Fathers, or Lexicon. But by this liberty any Heretike, though neuer ſo impious, may make the Scriptures ſpeake what himſelfe beſt pleaſeth.

(107) 2. Theſſ. 2. & 3.

(108) Col. 2. 20. τί δογματίζεσθε.

(109) Col. 2. 14. & Eph. 2. 15.

SECT. III.

That the Ancient Fathers do expound the ſacred Scriptures in Proofe of vnwritten Traditions.

IN the eight Generall Councell, it is taught that (1) *The great Apoſtle Paul doth cleerly admoniſh vs, to keepe the Traditions which we haue receaued, whether by ſpeach, or by the Epiſtles of holy men, who haue formerly shyned.*

(1) Act. 10.

S. Chriſoſtome expounding the ſame words of S. Paul, affirmeth that, (2) *Hereby it appeareth, that the Apoſtles did not deliuer all things by Epiſtle, but many things without writing, and theſe are worthy of faith, wherfore alſo let vs eſteeme the Tradition of the Church to be believed. It is a Tradition, ſeeke no further.* And the ſame expoſition is giuen by S. Baſil, Theophilact, and Damaſcene, as alſo by S. Epiphanius, (3) *We muſt vſe Tradition* (ſayth he) *for all things cannot be receaued from diuine Scripture, wherfore the holy Apoſtles haue deliuered ſome things by Tradition: Euen as the holy Apoſtle ſayth, As I haue deliuered to you, and elſwhere, ſo I teach, and haue deliuered in Churches.*

(2) In 2. Theſſ. ho. 4. And ſee Baſil de Spir. Sanct. c. 19. Theophil. in 2. Theſſ. 2. Damaſc. c. 17. de Imag. Sanctorum.

(3) Hær. 61.

S. Auſtine labouring to proue that thoſe who were baptized by heretikes ſhould not be rebaptized, ſaith; (4) *The Apoſtles commanded nothing hereof, but that Doctrine which was oppoſed herein against Cyprian, is to be believed to proceed from their Tradition; as many things be which the Church holdeth, and are therfore well believed to be commanded of the Apoſtles, although they be not written.* This ſaying is ſo cleere, that Cartwright ſpeaking therof, ſayth, (5) *To allow S. Auſtines ſaying is to bring in Popery againe.* And (6) *if S. Auſtines Iudgment, be a good Iudgment, then there be ſome things commanded of God, which are not in the Scriptures, and thereupon no ſufficient doctrine contayned in the Scriptures.*

(4) *De Bap. Cont. Don. l. 5. c. 23.*
(5) In Whitgif. Def. p. 1031.
(6) Ibid. And his 2. Reply ag. Whitg. part. 1. p 84. 85. 86.
(7) *Exam. part. 1. p. 87. 89. 90.*
(8) Againſt Purg. p. 362, 303, 397. Againſt Martial. p. 170. 178. Againſt Brifton. p. 35. 36.
(9) *De ſacra Script. p. 678. 681. 683. 685. 686. 690. 695. 696. 670.*

But the Fathers Expoſitions and beliefe, are ſo cleere for our Doctrine of Traditions, that Chemnitius reproueth for the ſame (7) *Clemens Alexandrinus*, and *Origen*, alſo *Epiphanius, Ambroſe, Hierome, Baſile, Maximus, Theophilus, Damaſcene.* And (8) D. Fulke reiecteth herein, *Chryſoſtome, Tertullian, Cyprian, Auſtine, Hierome*, and a great many more. And the like is acknowledged by (9) Whitaker of *S. Chryſoſtome, Epiphanius, Tertullian, Cyprian, Auſtine, Innocentius, Leo, Baſile, Euſebius, and Damaſcene.* By the premiſſes then it appeareth, that S. Auſtine and all the forenamed Fathers, did confeſſedly teach and believe our Doctrine of Traditions.

SECT. IV.

That the learnedſt Proteſtants are inforced to acknowledge, and believe our Catholike Doctrine of Traditions.

I Proued before that in the tyme of Nature, and much alſo in the tyme of the Law, the faithfull were inſtructed by Tradicions not written: And accordingly the Proteſtant D. Weſtphailing affirmeth that there was a tyme when (1) *Traditions not deliuered in writing, or taken out of Bookes, but deliuered from one to another by word of mouth, were Rules of faith and man-*

(1) *Serm. 5. fol. 66. & Ser. 6. fol. 80.*

ners:

ners: And thus it was first in the time of nature, secondly in the time of the Law. And in those times Traditions might well be Rules of truth to such as knew they came from those, whom Gods spirit would not suffer to erre. So confessedly Traditions have bene, and may be Rules of truth.

Concerning our learning the true sense of the Scriptures, the Protestant Author of Catholike Traditions prescribeth thus; (2) *when the Scriptures have not sufficient light, to make the truth apparantly perceyued, yee may a man now a dayes vse that meanes, which S. Irenæus counsaileth vs, which is to &c. learne the Apostolicall Tradition.* And this with greatest reason, for M. Powell teacheth that, (3) *Ecclesiasticall Traditions are not meerly humane, but also diuine, because the Church is directed and gouerned by the spirit of Christ.* Now, if this be the confessed Priuiledge of the Church, in things indifferent, and lesse concerning vs, it is much the rather to be acknowledged in such greater pointes of faith, as do more importantly concerne, euen our faith and Saluation.

(1) In the preface fol. B. 11.
(2) Of things Indifer. c. 2. p. 7.

But to giue particular instance of seuerall Traditions acknowledged by Protestants, the knowledge whereof is necessary to faith and saluation: Concerning the question of discerning Canonicall Scriptures from Apocryphall, M. Hooker affirmeth that, (4) *of things necessary the very chiefest is to know what bookes we are bound to esteeme holy, which point is confessed impossible for the Scripture it selfe to teach: for* (5) (sayth he very well) *if any one booke of Scripture did giue testimony to all, yet still that Scripture which giueth credit to the rest, would require another Scripture to giue credit vnto it:* (6) *neither could we euer come to any pause wherein to rest, vnlesse besides Scripture there were something else acknowledged.* Neither is this *something* the *testimony of the spirit, which* (as Whitaker (7) acknowledgeth) *being priuate and secret, is not fit to teach and to stoll others:* but it is euen according to him, (8) *the Ecclesiasticall Tradition, an Argument* (sayth he) *whereby may be argued and conuinced, what Bookes be Canonicall, and what not.* Which authority of the Churches Testimony in this behalfe, he further auoucheth and teacheth in fundry (9) other places. And with him agree many others of his brethren, for M. Hooker supposeth that, (10) *We all know, that*

(4) Eccl. Pol. l. 1. fec. 14. p. 80.
(5) Ibid. l. 2. fec. 4. p. 101.
(6) Ibid. pa. 101.
(7) Aduersus Stap. l. 2. c. 8. p. 370. 357. & Hook. Eccl. Pol. fec. 8. p. 147.
(8) Vbi supra l. 2. c. 4. p. 100, 198.
(9) Vbi supra l. 1. c. 2. p. 14. & 15. And against Reynolds. p. 46.
(10) Eccl. Pol. l. 3. p. 140.

that the first outward motiue leading men so to esteeme of the Scripture is the authority of Gods Church. Yea, saith another, (11) We would not beleeue the Ghospell, were it not that the Church taught vs, and witnessed that this Doctrine was deliuered by the Apostles.

(11) Treatise of the Script. and the Church c. 15.16 p 72. 74.

Zanchius (so much renowmed amongst Protestants) in plaine termes confesseth (12) the vnwritten Tradition of the Canonicall and Apocrypball bookes: and that (13) the Ecclesiasticall Tradition is the first meane of our certaine knowledge herein. As also that (14) The Fathers thought that we haue this thing only by Tradition of the Apostles, and Apostolicall men. In which due respect sayth Chemnitius, (15) We reuerently receaue this Tradition, wherby the Bookes of holy Scripture are to vs deliuered.

(12) De sacra Script p.281. (13) Ib.pa 61. (14) Ib p 205.

(15) Exam. part.1.p.69.

Luther like a dutifull Child ascribeth thus much to the Church his Mother, that, (16) This truely hath the Church, that it can discerne the word of God, from the words of men, as Austine confessed himselfe to haue beleeued the Ghospell, being moued by the authority of the Church. Melancthon, (17) We acknowledge in the Church this Authority of testifying of Apostolicall Scriptures, or of discerning the writings of the Apostles from counterfaite. Caluin, (18) I do not deny but that it is the proper office of the Church, to discerne true Scriptures from fayned. Peter Martyr, (19) We do acknowledge it to be the function of the Church, that seeing it is indued with the holy Ghost, it may discerne sincere and true Bookes of diuine Scriptures from adulterate and Apocrypball. Perkins, (20) The Church hath the guift of iudging of things of greatest waight; she can iudge of the Bookes of Scripture, which are Canonicall, which not, of the Spirits of men, and their Doctrines, and therefore she can iudge which company of men are the true Church, and which not. What more for the authority of the Church and her Traditions, in this so important a question of discerning true Scriptures from false, could be sayd by any Catholike?

(16) Tom.2. de Captiu. Babyl fol.89. (17) Resp ad Act. Ratisb. T.3.p. 732. (18) De vera Eccles. Refor. p.323. (19) In loc. class.1 c. 6. (20) Tom.2. of the Sermon of our Lord. col. 252.

D. Whitaker, a man so renowned in this Kingdome for his supposed greatest learning, acknowledgeth this same truth, no lesse plainly then the rest, (21) We do not deny (saith he) that it belongeth to the Church, that she approue, acknowledge, receyue, promulge, commend the Scriptures to all hers, and we say that this testimony is true, and ought to be receyued by all. (22) It is

(21) Controu. 2.q.3.c.2.pag. 325. (22) Ib.c.2.p. 326.

the

the office of the Church that she determine and discerne true, right, & proper Scriptures, from false, counterfait, and Adulterate. (23) *We may truly be compelled by the authority of the Church, that we acknowledge the Canonicall Scripture.* (24) *We confesse with Irenaus, the authority of the Church to be firme, and a compendious demonstration of Canonicall doctrine à posteriori.* Yea he affirmeth, that the testimony of the Church concerning the Scriptures, (25) *Ought to be receaued, because it is true: and he that doth not receiue it, is guilty of sacrilege.* Wherefore all Protestants that deny this Ecclesiasticall Tradition, of the Churches discerning Canonicall bookes from Apocryphall, in D. Whitakers Iudgement are sacrilegious.

(23) *Ib. c. 7. p. 324.*
(24) *Ib c. 9. p. 326.*
(25) *De Script. l. 2. c. 1 sect. 9. p. 19.*

If it were not to be thought tedious in so cleer a Case, I would shew the same to be taught by (26) Brentius, (27) Lubbertus, Peter Martyr, Iewell, and Fulke, most of them, and others affirming, that the Church is directed in her forsayd Testimony, euen with the presence and assistance of the *holy* (28) *Spirit.* So cleer it is that this so necessary knowledge of true Scripture from false, we haue not from the Scripture it selfe, nor from the Priuate Spirit, but from the Tradition of the Church. And if the Tradition of the Church be so forcible, in this Chiefe question of discerning true Scriptures, shall the same Scriptures make it of lesser Credit in other smaller questions?

(26) *In Zanchius de Scr. p. 193. 194.*
(27) *De primo capite Christ. dogm. l. c. 4 p. 18. Pet. Mar. com. plac. in Eng. part. 2. l. 2. sect. 8 p. 42. Iew. in Def. p. 101. Fulke in answere to a Counterf. Cath. p. 5.*
(28) *Whitak. aduers. Stapl. l. 1 c. 5. p. 69. The Treatise of the Scripture and the Church. c. 15. p. 71. Iew. Fulke and Pet. Mart. vbi supra.*

Rogers in the name of the Church of England, sayth, (29) *All of vs do grant, that the Church as a faythfull witnesse may, yea of necessity must testify to the world, what hath beene the doctrine of God his people, from tyme to tyme; and as a trusty Recorder, is to keep, and make known what the word of God, which it hath receyued is, which truly hath beene performed afore the word was written, by the Patriarches, and after the same was committed to writing, before Christ his incarnation, by the Iewes, Christ his lyfe tyme, in the Primitiue Church, from the Apostles tyme by the godly Christians throughout the world.* Agayne, (30) *The Church and euery member thereof in his place, is bound to the obseruation of all Traditions & Ceremonies, which are allowed by lawfull authority, and are not repugnant to the word of God; for he that violateth them, contemneth not man, but God, who hath giuen power to his Church, to establish*

(29) *Def of the Art. art. 20. p. 208.*
(30) *Ib. Art. 34. p. 296.*

whatsoeuer things shall make vnto comlines, order, and Edification. Heer then confessedly we haue one mayne poynt of fayth necessary to saluation, made knowne vnto vs, not by the Scriptures, nor by the Priuat Spirit, but only by the Tradition of the Church.

To alledge yet further another example, and that of great importance, which is concerning the abrogating of *Saturday* the Iewish *Sabath*, and the establishing of *Sunday* for our *Sabath*. First it is granted, that the new obseruation of Sunday, is not a thing arbitrary, & of indifferency, but necessary and vnchangeable: for thus expressly teacheth D. Whitguift, (31) *I do not thinke it now arbitrary, or to be changed: and surely there had been very little Iudgment in me, if I had made it changeable.* D. Fulke expressly teacheth, that this obseruation of Sunday (32) *Is not a matter of indifferency, but a necessary Prescription of Christ deliuered to vs by his Apostles. And that to change it, or keepe it on Munday, Tuesday, or any other day the Church hath no Authority.* And with him doth (33) M. Willet agree, expressing his like Iudgement almost in the same wordes. But none more fully confirme this truth, then the Diuines of Geneua, who in their Principles of diuinity disputed in the Vniuersity of Geneua, and there (34) discussed and determined euen by (35) the whole consent of the learned in the Church of Geneua, and especially by M. Theodore Beza, do conclude and teach that, (36) *The Apostles by direction of the holy Ghost inioyned of that seauenth day obserued vnder the Law, did appoint that day, which was first in Creation of the former world: and that the Obseruation therefore of this Lords day, is not take vp rather as an indifferent thing, but as an Apostolicall Tradition to be perpetually obserued.*

(31) Defence p. 89.

(32) Against the Rhem. Test. in Reuel. 1. sec. 9. fol. 483.

(33) Synop. Contron. 2. q. 8 p. 382.

(34) Preface.

(35) Epist. of the Transl.

(36) C. 7. p. 80. *sec.* 11. 13.

This then being supposed, that the obseruation of our now *Sunday*, is a matter obligatory, and of necessity; we will next examine whether the same be taught vs by the written word, or only by Traditions: and to omit what already herein is granted by D. Fulke, Willet, and the Diuines of Geneua; Bullinger auoucheth that (37) *We do not in any parte of the Apostles writings find any mention made that Sunday is to be kept holy.* And yet he beleeueth (38) Vrsinus, *this Apostolicall*

(37) *Serm. in Eng. Dec. 4. Serm. 6. p. 140.*

(38) *Comment. Catech. in Exod. p. 38.*

poſtolicall Tradition, and ſee it to be profitable. According to Whitguift, (39) *The Scripture hath not appointed what day in the weeke, ſhould be moſt meet for the Sabboth.* And he vrgeth Cartwright thus, (40) *You ſhould haue proued it to be appointed by the Scriptures, which no doubt you would haue done if you could, for that is it which I deny.* And yet both he and (41) Cartwright do cõfeſſe, that it was *taught by the Apoſtles.* And the ſame witneſſeth Fulke, ſaying, *for* (42) *the Preſcription of this day, the Apoſtles had either the expreſſe Commandement of Chriſt before his Aſcenſion, when he gaue them Precepts concerning the Kingdome of God.* (Act. 1. 2.) *or elſe the certayne direction of his Spirit.* So euident it is, and for ſuch further confeſſed by (43) Zanchius, that the obſeruation of Sunday is an Apoſtolicall and vnwritten Tradition. And the ſame is maintayned at large by (44) Bell. But D. Morton (45) obiecteth, that S. Iohn maketh mention of the (46) *Lords day*; that in the Acts mention is made of *the firſt of the* (47) *Sabboth*, when S. Paul and others were aſſembled to breake bread. And that S. Paul likewiſe commandeth the Corinthians to make Collections for the poore, vpon (48) *the firſt of the Sabboth.* But all theſe are impertinent, for S. Iohn calleth it the Lords day, not in regard that Saturday was then abrogated, or Sunday eſtabliſhed (for neyther of theſe points doth he affirme) but only in reſpect it was the day of our Lords Reſurrection. And as for the firſt of the Saboth, Caluin & the Centuriſts do (49) affirme, that thereby is not meant *Sunday*, but *Saturday*; and indeed the Greeke Text being the Originall, hath not, *The firſt of the Saboth*, but only (50) *one of the Saboth dayes*, and ſo do (51) Proteſtants tráſlate the ſame. But though the Text were that the Sacrament was vſually celebrated, and Collectiõs made for the Poore, vpon *the firſt of the Saboth:* yet this proueth not eyther that *Saturday* (whereof no mention in theſe places is made) ſhould be abrogated, or that *Sunday* ſhould be to vs, not onely as a Holy day, but alſo as our *Saboth*, and day of reſt. This anſwere is ſo cleere, as that it is likewiſe made and allowed by ſundry Proteſtãts, wherof ſayth M. Bel, (52) *No text of holy Scripture can be alleadged, which commandeth to keep our Chriſtian Sabboth vpon the firſt day, or any o-*

(39) Defence. p. 88.
(40) Ib. p. 91.
(41) Ib. & p. 89. 103.
(42) Aug. Rhem. Teſt. in 1. Reuel. fol. 401.
(41) De Relig. Chriſtiana. n. 12. pa. 7. & in Compend. doct. Chriſt. pag. 645. 646.
(44) Suruey of Popery. l. 3. part. 4 c. 3.
(45) Morton Apol. par. 2. l. 2 c. 41.
(46) Apoc. 1. 10.
(47) Act. 20. 7.
(48) 1. Cor. 16. 2.
(49) In Catal. Auguſt. Marlorat. & Cent. 1. l. 2. Col 503.
(50) ἐν τῶν μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων. Act. 20. 7. 1. Cor. 16 2.
(51) Engl. Bible of Anno 1568. Fulke

ag. Rhem. Teſt. in Act. 20. 7 & Cent. 1. l. 2. 495. 503.

ther determinate day. M. Calvin denieth flatly that, κατὰ μίαν σαββάτων, doth ſignify the firſt day, or Sunday. And that the Reuelation proueth nothing, but that S. Iohn had his Reuelation vpon the day of our Lords Reſurrection: but neither ſayth, that Chriſtians muſt obſerue that day for their Sabboth, nor that the Apoſtles kept the ſame, which thing both Peter Martyr, and Eraſmus do willingly graunt.

(51) Suruey of Popery.

So generally is it acknowledged by Proteſtants that the Abrogation of *Saturday*, and our Obſeruation of *Sunday*, is no where preſcribed or commanded in the written word, but only receiued by Tradition, and yet the ſame is a matter of neceſſity: And ſo ly ſling is M. Mortons Obiection.

(53) L. 4. c. 20.

D. Field acknowledgeth and ſummeth togeather many Traditions, ſaying, (53) *We admit firſt the Bookes of Scripture Canonicall as deliuered by Tradition: Secondly the chiefe heads of Chriſtian doctrine, contayned in the Creed: Thirdly the forme of Chriſtian Doctrine, and diſtinct explication of many things, ſomewhat obſcurely contayned in Scripture &c. Fourthly the continued practiſes of ſuch things as are not expreſſed in Scripture: Fifthly ſuch obſeruations as are not particularly commanded in Scripture:* Amongſt which, and the former he numbreth the *Faſt of Lent*, the *Baptiſme of Infants*, and *obſeruation of our Lords day*. And ſome few lynes after he confeſſeth that, *Many other things there are, which the Apoſtles doubtles deliuered by Tradition.*

We haue it heer then acknowledged moſt plentifully by the learnedſt Proteſtants, that ſundry Pointes of faith neceſſary to ſaluation, are not made knowne to vs by the written word, or any Priuate ſpirit, but only by the Tradition of the Catholike Church.

SECT. V.

Obiections againſt Traditions taken from Scriptures, anſwered.

IT is incredible, that men profeſſing learning, ſhould not be much aſhamed to produce ſuch poore and weake ſtuffe, againſt ſo cleere and confeſſed a Truth: for example, ſuch Texts

Texts are obiected (1) by M. Rogers, as ſeeme to forbid all Addition to the written word, as that of Moyſes, (2) *You ſhall not add to the word that I ſpeake to you, neither ſhall you take away from it:* As alſo that of S. Iohn, (3) *If any man ſhall add to theſe things, God ſhall add vpon him the Plagues &c.* I anſwere to the firſt, It concerneth not the written word only, but the word deliuered by mouth; *which* (ſayth he) *I ſpake to you*, & is therfore impertinent, for it proueth not that all the ſpoken doctrine was written. Secondly though it did concerne the written word only, yet the ſpeach of adding or taking away, is (as Cartwright confeſſeth) to be referred only to the obſeruing wholly of that which God commanded, (4) *that is, to do no more nor leſſe then he hath commanded:* which ſenſe is yet made more playne with conference of the premiſſes, with this other like ſaying in the ſame Booke, (5) *What I command thee, that only do to our Lord, neither add any thing nor diminiſh.* Thirdly howſoeuer it be vnderſtod, it can yet no more ſeclude the Apoſtles adding of their vnwritten Traditions to that which Moyſes ſpake, then it doth ſeclude their adding therto of their written Ghoſpell, and the Prophecies which were written after Moyſes. Add further that S. Iohn (as (6) Chemnitius confeſſeth) writ his Ghoſpell after the Apocalyps, and ſo addeth thereunto.

(1) Rogers Def. of the Art. art. 6. p. 27.
(2) *Deut.* 4. 2.
(3) *Apoc.* 22. 18.
(4) In whitgift. Defence p. 124.
(5) *Deut.* 12. 32.
(6) *Exam. p.* 202.

But Caluin (7) replyeth, that the Doctrine of the Prophets and of the new Teſtament, were not additions to the Law, but Explications therof (as being taught or contained in the Law, though not in particular, yet in generall.) But I ſuppoſe Caluiniſts will not deny, but that they beliue more then is written in the Law, and no otherwiſe doth the Law contayne them then in generall, and (as it were) virtually: but ſo likewiſe are Traditions conteyned therin, and ſo no Additions.

(7) *Inſtit. c.* 14.

M. Rogers alſo (8) obiecteth theſe words of S. Iohn, (9) *Many other ſignes alſo did Ieſus in the ſight of his Diſciples, which are not written in this Booke. And theſe are written that you may beleue, that Ieſus is Chriſt the ſonne of God, and that beleiuing, you may haue lyfe in his name*, therfore all things are written that are neceſſary to faith. Anſwere. This ſo plainly concerneth

(8) Def. of the Art. art. 6. p. 28.
(9) *Io.* 20. 30. 31.

only Christs Miracles, and not the Doctrine which he taught, that D. Whitaker saith therof, (10) *It is euident that the Euangelist speaketh of the signes and Miracles of Christ, not of his doctrine.* and so is altogeather impertinent. Secondly, though it should concerne doctrine, yet it concerned not the whole Scripture, but the only doctrine (as the Text sayth) *written in this Books*, and is therfore also impertinent, vnlesse we will thence also inferre, that S. Iohns Ghospell only is sufficient to instruct vs to Saluation. Which sequele D. Reinolds well perceiuing, affirmeth therupon that, (11) *There is contayned in S. Iohns Ghospell, so much as is sufficient to sayth and saluation; and that S. Iohns Ghospell alone is sufficient:* wherof it further followeth, that aswell the rest of the Scriptures, as also the institution of the Sacrament in formes of Bread and wyne, and all needfull doctrine concerning the same, which S. Iohns Ghospell doth not expresse, are not in his opinion necessary to Saluation: all which is most absurd & impious to affirme.

(10) *De Scrip. q.5.p.619.*

(11) Conclusions annexed to his Conference. p.686.

It is further vrged, that the Scriptures do condemne Traditions, as, *You* (12) *haue made frustrate the Commandement of God for your owne Tradition.* And, *Beware* (13) *least any man deceiue you, by Philosophy & vayne fallacy, according to the Tradition of men.* Answ. Such Traditions are not reprehended, as the Iewes receaued from Moyses, and the Prophets; but only such as they had receiued of later tymes, wherof some were Idle, others cõtrary to the Scriptures themselues, as *Why* (14) *do you transgresse the Commandement of God, for your Tradition?* And as here are condemned certaine Traditions, so before we haue heard others to be commended: which plainly argueth, that as some were forged, and contrary to Scripture, and so to be eschewed; so others were Apostolicall and to be obserued.

(12) *Mat.15. 6.*

(13) *Col.2.8.*

(14) *Mat.15. 3.*

(15) Rogers Def. of the Art. art. 22. p.118.

(16) *Gal.1.9.*

(17) *Ambr. in hunc locum. Aug.l. 17. cont. Faust.c.3.*

(18) *In Ioan. tract.98.*

Many (15) much insist vpon those words of S. Paul, (16) *If any preach to you besydes that which you haue receyued, be he accursed.* Answ. Here by the word, *besydes*, is meant, *against*, or contrary, for so do both S. Ambrose (17) and S. Austine expound this place: Yea S. Austine sayth of this very text, (18) *He doth not say* more *then you haue receyued, but* besides *that which*

which you haue receyued: for if he should haue said so, he should haue wronged himselfe &c. And though D. Whitaker will not acknowledge so much of this place, yet (19) *I confesse* (sayth he) *that παρα is sometymes fitly translated, Contra, against.* And so doth the same word signify in the same Apostle, (20) in which place Erasmus, and Fulke in their Translation thereof, do translate it, *Contra, against.* Yea here the sense is so euident, that Piscator doth affirme the Apostle to meane, *Doctrinam* (21) *Euangelio aduersam, doctrine contrary to the Ghospell;* which exposition these other words of the Text, *Another Ghospell,* do fully confirme. Secondly howsoeuer we vnderstand the same word, yet this place is meerly impertinent, as not concerning only the written word (which is the only thing wherof the question now is made) but such doctrine in general, as was preached. And that he did preach all needfull things (22) we stedfastly beleiue, as a matter out of question: but that he, and other Scribes of holy Writ, did write all needfull things, is the very point in question, and that which we deny. Thirdly this maketh no more against Traditions, then it doth against sundry parts of the new Testament, which were written after this Epistle, which would make the Apostle himselfe & others, in danger of his owne Curse. Lastly (23) it is made their chiefe and common obiection, that (24) *All Scripture &c. is profitable to teach, to argue, to correct, to instruct in iustice, that the man of God may be perfect, instructed to euery good worke.* And, *From* (25) *thyne infancy thou hast knowne the holy Scriptures, which can instruct thee to Saluation.* But the answere is easy and manifold, first, that wheras it is said, *All Scripture &c. is profitable,* the same prayse of being *profitable,* is attributed to euery part of the Scripture, as to the whole body therof, for by the Iudgment of all that vnderstand Latine, whatsoeuer is said of all Scripture, is vnderstood of euery Booke therof; and so indeed euery part of Scripture, and euery good Sermon, or spirituall Booke is profitable, but not sufficient to saluation. Secondly these places do not concerne the Scriptures of the New Testament, which were not then all written, but only the other of the Old Testament, which, sayth the Text, *Timothy had*

(19) *De Script. p. 718.*
(20) *Rom. 16. 17.*
(21) *In Gal. 2. 9.*
(22) *Act. 20. 20. 7.*
(23) Rogers Def. of the Art. art. 6. p. 28. Morton Apol par. 2. l. 2. c. 44.
(24) *2. Tim. 3. 16.*
(25) *2. Tim. 3. 15.*

knowne from his infancy, for theſe and not the other were they, which Timothy had to ſtudy from his Childhood. A truth ſo cleere, that M. Henoch Clapham confeſſeth with vs, ſaying, (26) *Nor was it other Scripture then the old Teſtament, which is commended to Timothy for able to make the man of God perfect vnto all good workes.* And the ſame vnderſtanding heere only of the old Teſtament, is made by Aretius, (27) Swinglius, M. Hooker and others: In ſo much as one of them perceyuing therby, that this foreſaid place is impertinent, vnleſſe we will withall thence affirme, that the Old Teſtament only is ſufficient, doubted not therfore to acknowledge that ſenſe, and ſo accordingly to vrge the ſame, maintayning thereupon contrary to M. Hookers Collection (28) vpon this place, (29) *that the Old Teſtament is ſufficient to Chriſtian men, for their Saluation, without any other writ:* to ſuch Iewiſh abſurdities do theſe impertinent Obiections dryue our Proteſtants.

(26) In the ſong of ſonges, lecture 25.
(27) *Loc. com. de Tradit. loc. 82. p. 264. Swingl. Tom. 2. l. Eccleſiaſt. fol. 43. Hook. Eccl. Pol. l. 2. ſec. 14. p. 88. Ochinus l. 2. Dial. p. 198. Treatiſe againſt the Def. of the Cenſure. pa. 325. Chemnit. Exam. part. 1 f. 38.*
(28) *Vbi ſupra.*
(29) In the Treatiſe againſt the Def. of the Cenſ. p. 325.

CHAP.

CHAP. VIII.

The true State of the Queſtion, concerning S. Peters Primacy.

Whether Chriſt our Sauiour ordayned S. Peter Supreme Head or Paſtour, not only of the Apoſtles, but of the Vniuerſall Church.

SECT. I.

Catholike Doctrine.

HAVING hitherto proued not the Scripture alone, but the Church of Chriſt, to be our abſolute Iudge of all Controuerſies in Religion, it ſeemeth neceſſary to find out the Head of the ſaid Church, and to inquire ſomthing into his power & authority: concerning which in the firſt Nicene Councell it is ſayd, (1) *He who houldeth the Sea of Rome, is the head and chiefe of all the Patriarches, ſeeing he is the firſt (or Chiefe) as Peter, to whome power is giuen ouer all Chriſtian Princes, and all their people, as he who is the Vicar of Chriſt our Lord, ouer all people, and the Vniuerſall Church of Chriſt: and whoſoeuer ſhall contradict this, is excommunicated by the Synode.* (1) Can. 19. Arabico.

The Fathers of the Councell of Epheſus auouch, (2) That (2) Part. 2. Act. 3.

That no man doubteth yea it is knowne to all ages, that holy and moſt Bleſſed Peter, Prince and head of the Apoſtles, Pillar of Fayth, and foundation of the Catholike Church, receyued from our Lord Ieſus-Chriſt &c. the keyes of the Kingdome; and that power of looſing and bynding ſinnes was giuen him, who in his Succeſſours liueth and exerciſeth iudgement to this very tyme, and alwayes. And agreably to this, we (3) ſtill teach, that S. Peter the Apoſtle was ordayned by Chriſt, to be in his place the Head and Prince not only of the Apoſtles, but of the whole Church, that ſo as Chiefe Paſtour vpon Earth, he might gouerne the ſame in matters Eccleſiaſticall.

(1) *Bellar. de Rom. Pont. l. 2. c. 10. Rhem. Teſt. in Io. 21. 17.*

Points Diſputable.

It was a Point much diſputed by S. Hierome and S. Auſtine, whether the thing, for which S. Paul reproued S. Peter, was truly any fault, though not in Doctrine, yet in conuerſation or Gouernment. S. Hierome and others thinke it was no fault at all, nor any other thing, then what Saint Paul did himſelfe vpon the lyke occaſion: But S. Auſtine houldeth the contrary.

(4) *Aug. ep. 9. n. 19.*

Proteſtants Vntruthes.

Tindall affirmeth, that, (6) *Paul by the teſtimony of Chriſt was greater then Peter.* But it wilbe impoſſible to fynd out this Teſtimony of Chriſt. D. Whitaker auoucheth that, (7) *Whatſoeuer mention is made of Peter, if we looke diligently into the place, we ſhall fynd nothing to be giuen to him, which doth not agree to other Apoſtles.* But this in the Sections next following, we ſhall cleerly ſee to be moſt falſe. And againe, (8) *Peter is not a Rocke, becauſe Chriſt doth not build his Church vpon Peter.* A ſaying moſt direct againſt ſundry playneſt textes of the Scriptures themſelues. Swinglius maketh our Sauiour to ſpeake contrary to himſelfe thus, (9) *I will build my Church vpon this Rocke, not vpon thee, for thou art not a Rocke &c. Only Chriſt, not Peter, is the Rocke, vpon which the Church built, remayneth.*

(5) *Act. 12. 26.*
(6) In Foxe Act. Mon. p. 1139.
(7) *Contron. 3. q. c. 3. pag. 604.*
(8) *Contron. 4. q. 2. c. 2. p. 545.*
(9) *De vera & fal. Relig. c. de clauibus.*

Prote-

Proteſtant Doctrine.

Moſt (10) Proteſtants affirme, that S. Peter was only equall, and fellow with the other Apoſtles, not ſuperiour. And that the Gouerment of the whole Church was no more committed to him by Chriſt, then to the reſt.

For the tyme ſince the Apoſtles, Proteſtants greatly differ among themſelues, for (11) ſome giue the ſupreme Gouerment of the Church to the Miniſters and the Laity. Caluin (12) chiefly aſcribeth it to the Congregation of Seniors or Miniſters. Brentius (13) and ſundry others, to ſecular Princes, men, women, or Children.

(10) *Luther in Aſſert. Art. 13. Calu. Inſt. l. 4. c. 6. §. 7. Magdeburg. Cent. 1. l. 2. c. 7 fol 324.*
(11) *Illyricus Cent. 2. l 2. c. 7.*
(12) *In Hiſt l. 4. c. 12 §. 6.*
(13) *In Prolegom. cont. Petrum à Soto.*

Proteſtants agree with ancient Heretikes.

The Councell of Conſtance condemned as hereticall this Article of Wiccliffe and Huſſe, (14) *Peter neyther was, nor is the Head of the Holy Catholike Church.* And the ſame error was taught by (15) Marſilius of Padua.

(14) *Seſſ 15.*
(15) *Apologia ad Ludouicum Bauarum.*

Proteſtant Errors.

Swinglius affirmeth that, (16) *The Papiſts contend the Church to be built vpon Peter, which is playne Idolatry.* Whitaker auoucheth that (17) *The Church is not founded vpon Chriſt, as he was to be ſeene, but as he could not be ſeene.* And (18) *Chriſt was not a viſible Monarch in the Church.*

(16) *In Explanat. Art. 30.*
(17) *Controu. 2. q 2. c. 2. p. 455.*
(18) *Controu. 4. q 1. c. 2. p. 525.*

Vallada affirmeth that, (19) *It is groſſe ignorance to make Ieſus-Chriſt the head of the Church, as he is man.* Yea ſayth Swinglius, (20) *It is impoſsible for a viſible man to be head of the Church, ſeeing it is inuiſible.*

(19) *Apol. cons. Epiſ. Luzon. c. 5. p. 322.*
(20) *Tom. 4. in Col. 2.*

So that now not only Peter and his Succeſſours, were not head of the Church, but neither Chriſt himſelfe, as he was man, and viſible vpon earth. But if viſibility and Manhood do hinder Chriſt from being head of the Church, It may ſeeme ſtrange, that the ſame Cauſes ſhould not hinder Princes and Miniſters from the ſayd Headſhip, which I thinke few Miniſters, or other Prot. dare affirme.

SECT.

SECT. II.

It is proued by Scriptures, that S. Peter was appointed by Christ the Supreme Head, not only of the Apostles, but of the vniuersall Church.

THe often (1) Contention had amongst the Apostles, who should be greateſt, argueth that they had some notice, that some one of them was to haue Primacy. And though our Sauiour in sundry places doth forbid ambition in them, and amongst others, where he sayth, (2) *Let the greatest amongst you, be as the least, and the chiefest, as he that serueth*; yet euen here he secludeth not Primacy, but affirmeth rather that one is *greatest* and *Chiefest*, whom he instructeth to be humble. And this he illustrateth by the different Gouerment of the kings of the Gentils, who raigne ouer their Subiects, and of himselfe who was (3) *amongst them, as one that serued*, and yet was their Superiour.

(1) *Mat.* 18. 26. *Mar.* 9. 34. *Luc.* 9. 46.
(2) *Luc.* 22. 26.
(3) *Luc.* 22. 27.

Now, that this *greatest* and *chiefest* was S. Peter, it is playne by Christs directing his speach to him presently after, saying, (4) *Simon, Simon, behould Sathan hath desired you, to winnow you as wheat, but I haue prayed for thee, that thy fayth faile not, and thou sometymes conuerted, confirme thy Brethren.* Here though the danger was common to all, yet Christ prayeth only and particularly for Peter, that his fayth should not fayle, preferring him likewise to be the confirmer of the rest.

(4) *Ib. ver.* 13.

Caluin (5) replyeth that, Christ sayth, (6) *but you not so*, that is, you must not beare rule ouer the Church, which thing the Kings of the Gentiles do. But much more rightly may I conclude, if not so, that is, after the manner of the Gentiles, then some of them were to Rule, but after another manner, to wit, that he that was *greatest*, should *be as the least*, and he that is the *leader*, as the *waiter*, to wit, by mildnesse, humility &c. he doth not say, none shalbe greater, none shall beare rule, none shalbe leader, but only that he that is such, let him be as lesser; yea he declareth this by example

(5) *Calu. Inst. l.* 4. *c.* 10. *§.* 7.
(6) *Mat.* 20. 25. *Luc.* 22. 25. *Mar.* 10. 42.

xample of himſelfe, ſaying, (7) *Euen as the Sonne of Man is not come to be miniſtred vnto, but to miniſter.* (8) And, *I am in the middeſt of you, as he that miniſtreth.* And yet he ſayth of himſelfe, (9) *You call me Maiſter and Lord, & you ſay well, for I am ſo.* By which it appeareth, that nothing is heere ſaid againſt Primacy in the Church, but only the beſt manner of vſing the ſame, is preſcribed.

(7) *Mat.* 20. 28. (8) *Luc.* 22. 27. (9) *Io.* 13. 13.

This forme of Gouerment S. Peter himſelfe after preſcribeth to Biſhops, (10) *Feed the flock, which is in you, prouiding for it, not by conſtraint, but willingly, not for filthy lucres ſake, but voluntarily: not as though you were Lords in the Clergy, but that yee may be enſamples to the flocke.* So cleere it is, that one amongſt the Apoſtles was to be Chiefeſt and greateſt, and this, S. Peter, and other Biſhops ſucceeding him.

(10) 1. *Pet.* 5.

And I verily perſuade my ſelfe, that it is not vnworthy of obſeruation, that though we ſearch into all Scriptures, Councels, Fathers, and hiſtories, we ſhall not find that any other of the Apoſtles but S. Peter, was thought or pretended by any to be the chiefeſt ouer the reſt, and ouer the whole Church.

Another ſtrong proofe of S. Peters Primacy, is taken from this promiſe of Chriſt made vnto him, (11) *And I ſay alſo vnto thee, thou art Peter, and vpon this Rocke I will build my Church, and the gates of hell ſhall not preuayle againſt it:* And, *I will giue vnto thee the keyes of the Kingdome of heauen, and whatſoeuer thou ſhalt bind vpon Earth, ſhalbe bound in heauen, and whatſoeuer thou ſhalt loſe on Earth, ſhal beloſed in heauen.* Out of this place foure principall points may be proued; firſt, that Peter was that Rock or foundation vpon which Chriſt promiſed to build his Church. Secondly, that to be the foundation of the Church, is to be the Gouernour of the Church. Thirdly, that the ſayd Peter it was, to whome Chriſt promiſed to giue the keyes of the Kingdome of Heauen. And laſtly that by thoſe keyes is vnderſtood the full power of gouerning the Church.

(11) *Mat.* 16. 18. 19.

The firſt point is proued ſundry wayes, as firſt by the pronowne (*this*) which demonſtrateth ſome *Rocke* wherof Chriſt had ſpoken a little before: now, immediatly before

Chriſt had called *Peter* a *Rocke*, for he ſpake in Siriacke, in which language *Peter* ſignifieth a *Rocke*, according to that in S. Iohn, (12) *Thou art Simon the ſonne of Iona; thou ſhalt be called Cephas, which is interpreted Peter*, or a Rocke, ſo that our Sauiour ſaid, *thou art a Rocke, and vpon this Rocke &c.* Now the reaſon why the Latin Tranſlatour ſaith, *tu es Petrus*, and not, *tu es Petra*, is becauſe tranſlating it out of Greeke, in which both πετρος, and πετρα, ſignify a Rocke, it was more conuenient to tranſlate it by a word of the Maſculine gender, as more agreable to a man.

(12) C. 1. 42.

Secondly, as of the exchange of Abrams name to Abraham, God expreſſed the cauſe to be (13) *for that a Father of many nations he had made him*: ſo our Sauiour hauing changed (14) *Simons* name to *Peter*, which ſignifyeth a *Rock*, giueth this reaſon therof, becauſe (15) *vpon this Rock I will build my Church*: and ſo to that end Simons name was changed to Peter, therby to ſignify that Peter was the Rocke vpon which Chriſt promiſed to build his Church.

(13) *Gen.* 17. 5
(14) *Io.* 1. 42.
(15) *Mat.* 16. 18.

But (16) D. Reinolds replyeth, that by *Rocke* is meant *Chriſt* himſelfe, according to that of S. Paul, (17) *For other foundation can no man lay, then that which is layd, which is Ieſus Chriſt*. But this is inſufficient, for though Chriſt be the firſt and principall foundation, yet in a ſecondary manner, both the Prophets & Apoſtles are called foundations by S. Paul (18) and S. Iohn. And the ſame is alſo cleered and anſwered by S. Baſil, who excellently teacheth, that, (19) *God imparteth his dignities, not depriuing himſelfe of them, but enioying he beſtoweth them; he is the light, and yet he ſayth, you are the light of the world; he is a Prieſt, and he annoynteth Prieſts: he is the Lambe, and he ſayth, Behould I ſend you like lambes amongſt the middeſt of wolues: he is a Rocke, and he maketh a Rock.* So plainly doth he teach that there is another Rocke beſids Chriſt. And immediatly before refuting this obiection, he telleth who this other Rock is, ſaying; *Though Peter be a Rock, yet he is not a Rock as Chriſt is: for Chriſt is the true Rock, vnmoueable of himſelfe, Peter vnmoueable by Chriſt the Rock.* What more cleerly can be ſpoken to make Peter a *Rock*? And agreably D. Whitguift (20) teacheth that, *names proper to God, are yet like in a ſe-*

(16) Reynolds in his Conf. c. 2. diuiſ. 2. Biſſ. part. 1 pa. 63.
(17) 1. Cor. 3. 11.
(18) *Eph.* 2. 20. *Apoc.* 21. 14.
(19) *Concionat de Pœnitentia.*
(20) Defence. p. 300.

condary

condary ſenſe, communicable to creatures. Agayn, the pronowne *This*, muſt relate to that which is nearer, which is *Peter*, not to the more remote, which is *Chriſt*: & what inconſequẽce of ſpeach would this be, Thou art Peter, or a Rock, & vpon my ſelfe will I build my Church? Laſtly, the Church was already builded vpon Chriſt, and therefore if it had beene meant of himſelfe, he would not haue ſayd, *I will build*, which betokeneth a thing to come, but, *I do build*, himſelfe being already a Rock.

Luther and others (21) yet reply, that by *Rock* is vnderſtood *Peters fayth*, or Peters confeſſion, not Peter himſelfe: But for the true vnderſtanding heereof, we muſt note, that this fayth or Confeſſion may be conſidered two wayes, firſt with reference to Peters perſon, as if our Sauiour had ſayd, vpon thee Peter confeſſing, and beliewing me to be Chriſt the ſon of the liuing God, will I build my Church; ſo that neither Peters perſon alone, nor faith & Confeſſiõ alone, but both ioyned togeather do make the forſaid Rock. And this is but agreable with that Catholike Doctrine, which teacheth that Peters fayth in two regards is called the Rocke of the Church: firſt becauſe for the merit therof, Peter obtained that he was to be the Rock of the Church. Secõdly, in that Peter is therefore chiefly the Rocke of the Church, that ſeeing his faith could not fayle, he was to ſtrengthen and confirme all others in fayth, for ſo our Sauiour ſayd to him, (22) *I haue prayed for thee, that thy fayth fayle not, and thou ſometymes conuerted, confirme thy Brethren:* Therefore, ſeeing that Peter by reaſon of this indefectible fayth, is a moſt ſtrong Rock, ſuſtayning the whole Church, it is all one then to ſay, vpon Peter, and vpon his fayth, the Church to be builded, and in thoſe reſpects, may we truly ſay, the Church to be builded vpon Peters Faith, or Confeſſion.

(21) *De pote. ſtate Papæ. & Cent. 1. l. 1. c. 4. Col. 175.*

(22) *Luc. 22. 32.*

Now, the ſecond way wherby Faith and Confeſſion may be vnderſtood, is barely of themſelues without all reference to Peters perſon, and in this ſenſe Proteſtants vrge it: but it is falſe, for then our Sauiour would not haue ſaid, *vpon this Rocke I will build*, but, *I do*, and haue built my Church, for as then already many had beliewed him to haue bene the

ſonne of the liuing God, as the Old Prophets, the B. Virgin Mary, Simeon, Zacharias, his Apoſtles and Diſciples. Secondly, *Faith* ſo taken is rightly ſaid (according to (23) S. Auſtine) *to be the foundation of our Iuſtification*, and all vertues, not of the Church; for the foundation and the reſt of the building muſt be both of the ſame kind. Now the Church is a Congregatiõ of men, as it were (24) of liuely ſtones, therfore the ſtone which muſt be the foundation, muſt be ſome man, not any vertue. Thirdly, all words of the Text do plainly argue, that ſome Priuiledge or peculiar authority was giuen to Peter for that his Confeſſion; all which were taken away, if that only fayth of Chriſt (which was common as then to others with him) were only the Rocke of the Church.

(23) *Serm. 22. de verb. Apoſt.*

(24) 1. *Pet.* 2. 5.

S. Peter then being the Rocke whereupon Chriſt promiſed to build his Church, the next thing to be declared is, that to be the Rocke or foundation of the Church, is to be the chiefe Paſtor or Gouernour therof; that the foundation in a building, is as the head in a Body, a gouernour in a Citty, and a king in his kingdome. For the prouing herof we muſt note, that in holy Scriptures the Church or company of faithfull, is called (25) *the houſe of Chriſt*, and (26) *Gods building*; now as the reſt of the building in a materiall houſe, dependeth of the foundation, as vpon that which wholy vpholdeth it; ſoe in that ſpirituall building of the Church (which Chriſt promiſed to found vpon a Rock, & which Rock we haue proued to be Peter) the ſame dependeth vpon that Rock whereupon it is founded. Now what other dependance can be imagined, betweene the reſt of the Church, & Peter their foundation, then that vpon him, as a firme Rock, they ſhould wholy rely in all matters of fayth and Religion, to be inſtructed, gouerned, and confirmed, & ſo euer vpholden and ſuſtained in true fayth, againſt all the ſtormes of falſe Doctrines, and the Profeſſours therof.

(25) *Heb.* 3. 6.
(26) 1. *Cor.* 3. 9.

But ſome reply, that as Peter here, is called the foundation of the Church, ſo are likewiſe the Prophets & Apoſtles in other (27) places. Anſw. They are called ſo indeed in three reſpects; firſt, in that they were the firſt, as well as Peter, that planted Churches, and conuerted Countryes to Chriſt,

(27) *Eph.* 2. 20. *Apoc.* 21. 14.

Christ, in which sense they are so called in the (28) Apocalyps. Secondly, in that the faith of the Church dependeth vpon the Reuelation which the Prophets and Apostles receiued from God, and which they by their preaching and writing, haue left to Posterity, and so they are called foundations by S. Paul; and in these two respects all the Apostles were equall. Thirdly in regard of Gouernment, for they were all Rectors and Pastors of the whole Church, but not in the same manner that S. Peter, he being as an Ordinary Pastor, from whom (as shalbe hereafter (29) proued) the orderly succession of true Pastors, was to continue vntill the end of the world, they only but as Apostles, or Legates for the tyme. And in this respect (which pertayneth only to the present Controuersy) as also in that Peter was the head or chiefe amongst the Apostles themselues, the Church is said to be built vpon Peter, & not vpon the rest of the Apostles.

(28) Apoc. 21. 14.

(29) See hereafter.

The third Principall point therfore remayning to be proued is, That these words, *To thee I will giue the keyes of the kingdome of heauen*, are meant of Peter. And in truth so many words of the Text it selfe do so plainly show it, as a man would more admire, that any should deny it, then much trouble himselfe in seeking to proue it: for who reading, *Blessed art thou Simon, the sonne of Ionas &c.* And, *I say also vnto thee, thou art Peter &c.* And, *I will giue vnto thee the keyes of the kingdome of heauen*, would not say, that to Simon, who was afterwards called Peter, the said keyes were giuen?

But some conceite, that whatsoeuer is here said to Peter belongeth to the whole Church, which he only at that tyme did represent. But for answere hereto, we must obserue, that two wayes Peter may be said to beare the person of the Church; first historically, which is, when one hauing done a thing himselfe, doth also therin represent a thing to be done by another, as Abraham hauing indeed two sonnes, did therin also represent, that God was to haue two people, as S. Paul (30) expoundeth. Secondly parabolically, when nothing truly done is proposed, but something alike is feygned, to signify another thing, as in the Ghospell, he that *sowed good seed*, signified Christ preaching. And in the first

(30) Gal. 4. 24.

ſenſe, it is true, that Peter as then repreſented the Church, in that to him were giuen the keyes, which after were to be Communicated to the Church: but this maketh not againſt, but with vs; vnleſſe we will ſay, that Abraham had not two ſonnes, becauſe therein he repreſented God to haue two people. And that it is not to be vnderſtood in the ſecond ſenſe, is plaine, aſwell that euery circumſtance doth (as it were) marke out the very particular perſon of Peter, as alſo in that to the ſame, it is ſaid, *To thee I will giue the keyes &c.* to whom it is ſaid immediatly after (verſe 29.) *Go after me Sathan*, for the name *Peter* is alike in both places; and that by Sathan, is meant Peters perſon is playne, and for ſuch (31) acknowledged by the ancient Fathers, and all Proteſtants (in their knowne loue to Peter) do eaſily belieue it.

(11) *Hilar. de Trinit. l. 6. & 10. & in Pſ. 131. Aug. l. 2. cont. duas ep. Gaud. c. 23.*

Others obiect that Peter ſpake in the name of all the Diſciples, when he ſaid, *Thou art Chriſt &c.* And therfore he likewiſe heard in the name of all, *To thee I will giue the keyes.* Anſwer. Peter ſpake in the name of the reſt, not as a Cryer, foreknowing what would be the anſwere of the reſt, for neither had they giuen him that in charge, no nor (32) conſulted with him therof, as many ancient Fathers do obſerue; he alone knowing it by reuelation from God, according to that which Chriſt preſently therfore ſaid, *Flesh and bloud hath not reueyled it vnto thee, but my Father which is in heauen:* he is therfore ſaid to ſpeake in the name of the reſt, becauſe to that, which he as chiefe and head had vttered, they by their ſilence, gaue their aſſent, which thing maketh wholly for Peters Primacy.

(12) *Hilar. in hunc locum & l. 6. de Trinit. Chryſoſt. hom. 55. in Matth. Cyril. l. 12. in Ioan. c. 64. Aug. Ser. 124. de Temp. Leo Ser. 11. de paſſ. Domini, & ſer. 2. de SS. Petro & Paulo.*

It is further replied, that as to Abraham (33) *Fayth was imputed to iuſtice*, ſo alſo it is imputed to all others that belieue, therfore if Peter receiued the keyes becauſe he confeſſed Chriſt, then all ſuch as confeſſe Chriſt, ſhall likewiſe receiue them. Anſw. Abraham by fayth was not only iuſtified, but alſo made (34) *a Father of many Nations*, and yet all ſuch as belieue are not made ſuch Fathers. The anſwere therfore is, that faith of its owne nature doth lead and bring a man to Iuſtice, if other things neceſſary thereunto be not wanting, as Hope, Charity &c. But Confeſſion of Chriſt doth

(33) *Rom. 4. 9*

(34) *Rom. 4. 17.*

doth not of its owne nature lead a man to receiue the keys, for ſundry other wayes might Chriſt haue rewarded Peter worthily for his Confeſſion, if it had ſo pleaſed his heauenly wiſdome.

Some demaund whether Peter dying, the keyes remayned in the Church, or ceaſed with him? If the firſt, then they were giuen to the Church; if the ſecond, then no man now hath authority to looſe or bynd. Or thus, When the Pope is choſen, he eyther bringeth the keyes with him, or not; if the firſt, then he was Pope before he was made; if the ſecond, from whence had he them? Did ſome Angell bring them from heauen, or rather did he not receyue them from the Church, to whome they were giuen in the beginning? Anſw. Peter, or the Pope dying, the keyes do not periſh, neyther remayne formally in the Church but only as they are communicated to inferiour Paſtours, but they remayne in the hands of Chriſt: and when a new Pope is choſen, he doth not bring them with him, neyther are they giuen him by the Church, but by Chriſt, neyther by any new deliuery, but by his auncient Inſtitution. Euen as a King when he doth place a Vice-roy ouer ſome Country, ſhould withall make knowne, that it is his Royall pleaſure, that the ſayd Viceroy dying, the Country ſhall chooſe and nominate another, to whome he already giueth the ſame power and authority, as to the former.

Laſtly, it is obiected, that as heer to Peter are promiſed the keyes, ſo the ſame authority to be promiſed to the (35) reſt of the Apoſtles, *Whatſoeuer you ſhall bynd vpon earth, ſhalbe bound in heauen, and whatſoeuer you ſhall looſe &c.* Anſw. As before it is ſhewed in what ſenſe they are truly called foundations, ſo heer likewiſe they are ſayd to haue authority to bynd & looſe, but that this was giuen to them, not as to ordinary Paſtours, but only as to Legates for the tyme, and withall with certayne ſubordination to Peter, ſhalbe ſhewed heerafter. And I wiſh only, that it may be further obſerued, that Chriſt ſpeaking of one matter, to one perſon, in one and the ſame ſentence, to whomeſoeuer he made the firſt promiſe, to him he made the reſt. Therefore if he

(35) Mat 18. 18.

if he promised the keies to all the Apostles, vpon them all he promised to build his Church, and not vpon himselfe. Or if he promised to build his Church vpon himselfe, to himselfe he promised the keies of the kingdome of heauen, to himselfe he promised all power of bynding and loosing, which had bene as impertinent to our Sauiours discourse, as dissonant from truth: for Christ had all that power before giuen by his Father, when he was first sent.

The last principall thing then to be proued, is, that by giuing the *keies* to Peter, is vnderstood the giuing of the chiefe authority ouer the whole Church vnto him; for by

(36) Isa.22.22. *keyes*, is vnderstood (36) *principality*, as where the Institution of the high Priest Eliachim, being described, it is said, *And I will giue the key of the house of Dauid, vpon his shoulder, and he shall open, and there shall be none to shut, and he shall shut, & there shall be none to open: here*, by *key*, is vnderstood Eccleſiasticall

(37) Isa.9.6. principality, whereunto pertayneth that, (37) *And his principality is vpon his shoulders*, for therefore is *Principality* said to be vpon the *shoulder*, because the *keyes* (wherwith it is signified) were accustomed to be layd vpon the *shoulder*. Christs *Principality* also is plainly signified by *keyes*,

(38) Apoc. 3. 7. (38) *These things saith he that is holy and true, which hath the key of Dauid, which openeth, and no man shutteth, and shutteth and no man openeth*. As also it is a common custome in politicke gouerment, that when any Citty is yielded to any Prince, or Gouernour, the *keyes* therof are deliuered withall, in signe of their subiection. So our Sauiour to signify the ample power that he would giue to Peter ouer his Church, promised him the keyes of the kingdome of heauen. So many wayes it is proued cleerly, that by the foresaid words of our Sauiour vnto Peter, he ther by promised to make him supreme head of his Church.

(39) Io. 21.15. To come therefore to the performance of the foresaid promise; S. Iohn telleth vs that, (39) *Iesus said to Simon Peter, Simon of Iona louest thou me more then these? he said vnto him, yea Lord thou knowest that I loue thee: he said vnto him, feed my Lambes. He said vnto him againe the second tyme, Symon of Iona louest thou me? he said vnto him, yea Lord &c. he said vnto him, feed*

my

my sheep &c. Here our Sauiours speach is so direct to Peter alone (as is manifest by all circumstances, especially by those words, *Louest thou me more then these?*) as all other speciall proofe therof is needlesse. Now, that by those words, *Pasce oues meas, feed my sheep*, the chiefe Ecclesiasticall power is giuen to Peter, is proued first by the word *Pasce, feed*, which in Scriptures signifyeth to gouerne or beare rule; so where it is said, *For out of thee shall come a* (40) *Captaine*, or as Prot. (41) translate *a Gouernour, which shall gouerne my people of Israel*; in the Greeke it is ποιμανῶ, which signifyeth to *feed:* Now that there is vnderstood Christs Gouerment, & chiefe power ouer the people, is of it selfe manifest. As also it is said (42) from whence S. Mathew tooke that saying, *Out of thee shall come forth vnto me, he that shalbe the Dominatour or Ruler in Israel*; where the Hebrew word signifieth not, *pascere*, to *feed*, but *dominari*, *to rule*. In like sort it is said of our Sauiour, (43) *He shall rule them with a rod of Iron:* in the Greeke it is ποιμανεῖ, *feed*. So also Homer (l. 2. Iliad) calleth king Agamemnon ποιμένα λαῶν, *pastorem populorum, the Pastour of the people.*

(40) *Mat.* 2. 6.

(41) *English Bib. of Anno* 1578.

(42) *Mich.* 5. 2.

(43) *Apoc.* 19. 15.

Secondly, he is not properly said to feed another which in any respect helpeth another to meat, but he that prouideth and procureth meat for another, which is a thing proper to a Maister, or (44) Gouernour, *who is a faithfull steward and wise, whom the Maister shall make Ruler ouer his household to giue them in season their measure of wheat:* So that it is his part to *feed*, who is appointed ouer the family for Steward and Ruler. Besides, it is not the part of a Pastour or Shepheard, only to giue meat to his flocke, but also to guide them, defend them, gouerne them, and correct them when they go astray.

(44) *Luc.* 12. 42.

Thirdly, no reason can be alleadged, why so seuerally it should be said. to Peter, *To thee I will giue the keyes*: and *feed my sheepe*, and that for his singular faith and Charity, if therby he had receyued nothing aboue the rest.

Fourthly, by those words, *My sheepe*, is vnderstood the whole Church of Christ, not any one or other part therof: for seeing without all restriction, the Pronowne, *Myne*, is

ioyned to the Nowne, *Sheep*, it manifeſtly followeth, all thoſe *sheep* to be commended to Peter, to whom the Pronowne *Myne*, extendeth: now, it is certaine that it extendeth to all, for there is not any in the Church, who will not glory himſelfe to be Chriſts *sheep*. Beſides when one dying ſaith, I leaue my goods to my Children, he excludeth none of his goods, nor any of his Children; further our Sauiour either commended hereby to Peter, all his ſheepe, or none, or ſome determinate company, or ſome indeterminate: Now none will ſay, that he commended none, or ſome determinately, for that is manifeſtly falſe; neither any indefinitely, for no wiſe Prouider doth leaue an vncertain care, when he may determinate the ſame, ſeing certaine confuſion and perturbation ariſeth thereby: yea to commend ſome, and not to determine which, is as much as to cõmend none; for which ſhall he feed, who knoweth not his flock? It remaineth therfore that Chriſt aſſigned to Peter euen all his flock to be fed, and conſequently the reſt of the Apoſtles themſelues, ſeing they were part of Chriſts flock.

(45) *Controu. 4 q 2. c. 4. p. 573.*

(46) *In hunc locum*

D. Whitaker anſwereth hereto, that, (45) *Chriſt commended his sheep to Peter indefinitely, not to feed theſe or thoſe sheepe, but ſometimes theſe, ſometimes thoſe*. Agreable to which ſayth Beza, (46) *Is the word of God thus to be prophaned? Truly Chriſt did adde* πανλας *, not* παντας, (that is, *all, not vniuerſall*) *and the difference is knowne betweene indefinite, and vniuerſall propoſitions.* But all this is friuolous, for Prot. do limit propoſitions vniuerſall, aſwell as indefinite. And therfore Caluin himſelfe ſhall anſwere this, telling them, that (47) *an indefinite ſpeach importeth as much as an vniuerſall.* Wherfore if, as Whitaker confeſſeth, Chriſt commended his ſheepe to Peter indefinitly; he commended all, and euery one of his ſheepe.

(47) *In 1. Ioan. 3. 3.*

(48) *Mat. 20. 22.*

(49) See alſo *Luc. 22. 8. 10. 31 2. Mat. 17. 2 Mar 5. 37. & 11. 1.*

(50) *Mat. 10. 2. Mar. 3. 16. Luc. 6. 14. Act. 1. 13.*

(51) *Mar. 5. 37. Luc. 8. 51.*

Another proofe from Scripture for S. Peters Primacy, is taken from the manner of numbring the Apoſtles, which is commonly by beginning with (48) Peter. Now the names of the twelue Apoſtles were theſe, *the firſt Simon who is called Peter, and Andrew his Brother, Iames &c.* (49) whereas the order of the reſt is often chãged. (50) Yea where two or three are but named, he is commonly the firſt, (51) and

ſo

ſo in all other places, one only (52) excepted, where it is ſayd, *Iames, Cephas, and Iohn.* And yet it is not certayne whether S. Paul ſo ſaid: for diuers (53) ancient Fathers both in the text and in their Commentaries read, *Peter, Iames, and Iohn*. But if we admit, that it ſhould be ſo read, then, it may eyther be ſayd, that it was ſo done, becauſe Iames was Biſhop of Hieruſalē, where thoſe three Apoſtles then were, or elſe that S. Paul did not obſerue any order in this place: for that S. Paul knew that Peter was aboue Iames, may appeare, in that in the ſame Epiſtle he ſayth, (54) *He went to Hieruſalem to ſee Peter*, not to ſee Iames, though he were in the ſame place, as alſo (55) he proceedeth aſcending, and placing Peter next vnto Chriſt.

(52) *Gal.* 2. 9.
(53) Ambroſe Aug & Hieron. vpon this place, & in the text, & in their Commentaries.
(54) *Gal.* 1. 18.
(55) 1. *Cor.* 15. 12.

Further, Peter is not only placed in the firſt place, but alſo is deſcribed as a Captayne or Prince of the reſt; for as it is ſaid, (56) *Michael and his Angels*, (57) *The Diuell and his Angels*; ſo it is ſayd, (58) *And Simon, and they that were with him, followed him*; (59) *Peter ſayd, and they that were with him*; (60) *Tell his Diſciples and Peter*. Neither can it be anſwered to theſe, that Peter is thus placed, either becauſe he was firſt called by Chriſt, for that was not he, but his brother (61) *Andrew*, or becauſe he was the eldeſt in yeares, for *Andrew* was Elder, which thing our (62) Aduerſaries acknowledge for probable, or elſe becauſe of his excellent guifts; for eyther that is meant of thoſe guifts which he had in regard of the Church, as that he receyued ſingularly the keyes, that he was made the foundation of the Church, and Paſtour of all Chriſts ſheep &c. or elſe it is meant of his perſonall guifts and vertues: if the firſt, it maketh wholly for vs; not the ſecond, for the Euangeliſts could not eaſily know, neyther durſt iudge, which of the Apoſtles was moſt vertuous, for Iohn was called the Apoſtle whome Ieſus loued, and Iames the leſſe was of ſuch ſanctity as that he was called the Iuſt, and the Brother of our Lord. Laſtly, it cannot be ſayd to be caſuall, in that ſome one was to be put firſt in the Catalogue, aſwell in that, as all the Euangeliſts euer put Peter firſt, ſo yet they keep no one certaine order in placing of the reſt, excepting Iudas, who for vnworthines, they ſtill place laſt.

(56) *Apoc.* 12. 7.
(57) *Ib. verſ.* 9.
(58) *Mar.* 1. 36.
(59) *Luc.* 8. 45.
(60) *Mar.* 16. 7. See alſo *Luc.* 9. 32. *Act.* 2. 14. 5. 29. 1. *Cor.* 9. 5.
(61) *Io.* 1. 39, 40.
(62) *Cent.* 1. *l.* 2. *c.* 10.

as they do S. Peter for his preheminence, first; which argueth a speciall respect of Peters placing: as also in that S. Mathew (63) calleth Peter, *primus, the first*, not reckoning the rest, one, the second, and another the third &c. but without all obseruation of order: so that betwixt Peter and the rest he obserueth order, because Peter was Superiour, and the rest Inferiours; but amongst the rest he obserueth none, because they were all equall amongst themselues: And of the word, *Primus*, cometh *Primatus*, euen as of *Princeps, Principatus*, of *Consul, Consulatus*.

(63) C. 10. 2.

This is so conuincing, that Beza (64) for want of better answere, barely suspecteth the word, *first*, to be thrust into the Text by some fauourer of Peters Primacy. *What if this word*, *Primus* (sayth he) *be added by some, who would establish Peters Primacy? And yet* (sayth he) *we find it so written in all Copies.* But if this might suffice for an answere, euery heretick might euade all Scripture, though neuer so cleere.

(64) In his annotations vpon the New Test. of Anno 1556. in Mat. 10. 2.

But that you may better know this Beza, here he confesseth that the word, *first*, is written in all Copies; and yet he will needs suspect, that it is thrust into the text by some friend of Peters. And yet Mar. 3. 16. where it is only said; *He gaue to Simon the name Peter*, here himselfe thrusteth it into the Text, saying, *And the first was Simon*; and the same Addition is also made in some of our (65) English Bibles. What a masse of Contrarieties may be found in this man? In the first place, where the word, *first*, is to be truly seene in all Copies, there will he haue it to be added to the Text by some forger: here where it is not, he will haue it part of the true Text, and that because Matthew readeth so, and yet next before he suspecteth not Mathew, but some late Papist to haue read so. In the first place, there could not be, *first Simon*, because there is no consequence of *second, third &c.* here he saith, that is no impediment, because there be many examples of such speach, and namely in that place of Mathew. There it is not so, though all Greeke Copies haue it so: here it must needs be so, because Beza will haue it so, though it be only found in certaine odd Copies of Erasmus, which Erasmus himselfe, as Beza confesseth, allowed not.

(65) Of Anno 1578. 1579.

If

If after Christ had giuen to Peter and the rest of the Apostles, Apostolicall authority in common, saying, *Whose sinnes you forgiue &c. Preach the Ghospell &c.* he had neuertheless said seuerally to Peter, *Peter thou art not a Rocke, I will not giue to thee the keyes of the kingdome of heauen, Thou shalt not feed my sheepe, Peter is not the first of the Apostles*, and the like; what Protestant reading this, would doubt to affirme, but that the chiefe authority ouer the Church, were denied to Peter? Seing then, in these Negatiue Propositions, they doubtles would affirme chiefe authority to be denied to Peter, they must likewise affirme by the contradictory affirmatiue propositions expressed in Scripture, chiefe authority to be giuen to Peter.

Lastly, it is not to be neglected, that diuers Priuiledges and honours were giuen to Peter, which were not giuen to the rest of the Apostles, at that he was the only man among the Disciples, that (66) *walked vpon the waters with Christ*: that he was the only man for whom Christ (67) *payed tribute*: In *Peters* (68) *ship*, and not in the other did Christ teach: the Apostles in generall being asked by Christ, who he was, Peter was the only man that (69) *answered*: for him only Christ prayed, (70) *that his faith should not fayle*: To him only he said, (71) *Feed my sheep*: him only he (72) *calleth Peter*, or a *Rock*, and accordingly promiseth to *build his Church vpon this Rock*: Peter is the first that speaketh in the *Councell* (73) of the Apostles: he prescribeth *Election* (74) to be made of one in Iudas place: he standing (75) *among the Eleuen*, taketh vpon him to make the first Sermon to the people: When Ananias had fraudulently left a porion of his riches at (76) *the feet of the Apostles*, Peter only rebuketh him, & inflicteth vpon him present death: Peter was the only man of all the Apostles (77) *whom to see, Paul went to Hierusalem*: Lastly he is the only Apostle that hath the vsuall preheminence in the order of being *first* named, as is before shewed; In so much as when the Apostles are but spoken of in generall, yet often he only for honour sake is named. All which things being so peculiar only to Peter, from the other Apostles, could not be casuall to him rather then to the other, but purposely ob-

(66) *Mat.* 14. 29.
(67) *Mat.* 17. 27.
(68) *Luc* 5. 3.
(69) *Mat.* 16. 16.
(70) *Luc.* 22. 31.
(71) *Luc.* 21. 16.
(72) *Mat.* 16. 13.
(73) *Act.* 1. 15. & 5. 29. & 15. 7.
(74) *Act.* 1. 22.
(75) *Act.* 2. 14.
(76) *Act.* 5. 2 3 5.
(77) *Gal.* 1. 18.

obſerued, and ſo ſet downe in regard of his knowne Primacy.

I will only add hereto, that ſeing the beſt Gouerment is acknowledged by all, to be Monarchicall, that therfore the Gouerment of the Church is to be by one ſupreme Paſtour vpon Earth. And although Caluin (78) replyeth, this not to follow, becauſe Chriſt is the King and Monarch of the Church: yet this is inſufficient; for though Chriſt be the true and proper Monarch of the Church, gouerning the ſame ſpiritually and inuiſibly, yet the Church being corporall & viſible, needeth ſome one viſible Iudge, by whom Controuerſies in Religion aryſing, may be compoſed, and who may keepe the other inferiour Prelates in vnity & due performance of their offices. Yea this maketh no more againſt one ſupreme Paſtour, then it doth againſt all other Biſhops, Paſtours, and Doctours, who by the ſame reaſon were needleſſe, for Chriſt is (79) the Paſtour and Biſhop of our ſoule, he is our Maiſter whom we are commanded (80) to heare; he it is, who baptizeth (81) in the holy Ghoſt. And therfore, as other Biſhops and Paſtors do that as Chriſtes Miniſters, which himſelfe doth principally; ſo the like may be ſaid of one ſupreme Paſtor. Thus much of the plaine Texts of Scripture in proofe of S. Peters Primacy.

(78) *Inſt. l. 4. c. 6. §. 9.*

(79) *1. Pet. 2. 25.*

(80) *Mat. 17. 5.*

(81) *Io. 1. 33.*

SECT. III.

That the Fathers expound the ſacred Scriptures agreably with Catholickes, in Proofe of S. Peters Primacy.

NOw, that the ancient Fathers do expound the foreſaid Scriptures agreably with vs Catholickes, in behalfe of S. Peters Primacy, it ſhall ſundry wayes appeare; as firſt concerning the change of his name from Simon to Peter, which ſignifieth a Rock; S. Cyrill affirmeth, that, (1) *Chriſt &c. foretould that his name ſhould not be Simon, but Peter, aptly ſignifying by the very word, that vpon him as vpon a Rock, and firme ſtone, he was to build his Church.* To the ſame purpoſe S. Hilary (2) ſaith moſt elo-

(1) *In Ioan. c. 12.*

(2) *In Math. Can. 16.*

eloquently, *O happy foundation of the Church, in naming of the new name, and worthy Rock of that building, which should diſsolue the infernall Lawes, and gates of Hell &c. O happy Porter of heauen, to whoſe arbitrement the keyes of Eternall entrance are deliuered &c.* S. Gregory is ſo confident in this, as that he demaundeth, (3) *Who knoweth not that the holy Church is founded vpon the ſolidity of the Prince of the Apoſtles, ſeing the firmenes of his mynd he tooke in his name that of a Rock he ſhould be called Peter? to whom by the voyce of Truth it is ſaid: To thee I will giue the keyes of the kingdome of heauen.* Theſe Fathers ſhow from the Scriptures, that therfore the name Simon was changed to Peter, which ſignifieth a Rock, becauſe he was to be the Rock, vpon which Chriſt would build his Church.

(1) L. 6. Ep. 3.

Now, that S. Peter was the Rock, vpon whom Chriſt would build his Church, it is taught by S. Chriſoſtome in theſe words, (4) *Our Lord ſayth, Thou art Peter, and vpon thee I will build my Church:* what more cleere then, *Vpon thee?* S. Hierome auoucheth that, (5) *According to the Metaphore of a Rock, it is rightly ſaid to him, I will build my Church vpon thee.* S. Athanaſius, (6) *As the diuine Scripture ſayth truly, Thou art Peter, and vpon thy foundation the Pillars of the Church are ſtrengthened.* S. Ambroſe, (7) *If therfore Peter be the Rock vpon which the Church is built &c.* Theſe Fathers expreſly teach from the Scriptures, that vpon Peter himſelfe, as vpon a Rock, the Church was to be built.

(4) Ho. 55. in Mat.
(5) In. c. 16. Math.
(6) Ep ad Felicem.
(7) Ser. 68. & 47. & ſee S. Leo Ser. 1. de anniuerſario aſſumptionis ſuæ ad Pontificatum.

S. Auſtine maketh not only S. Peter, but euen his Sea after him to be the Rock, ſaying, (8) *Number the Prieſts from the very Sea of Peter, that is the Rock which the gates of Hell do not ouercome.* And againe, (9) *only* (Peter) *amongſt the Apoſtles deſerued to heare, Amen, I ſay to thee, thou art Peter, and vpon this Rock I will build my Church, worthy truly who to the people, which were to be builded in the howſe of God, might be a ſtone for their foundation, a pillar for their ſtay, a key to open the gates of the kingdome of heauen.* And elswhere he ſayth, (10) *O Church, that is, O Peter, becauſe vpon this Rock I will build my Church: kill and eate.* S. Auſtines opinion in this was ſo cleere, that the Prot. Hamelmannus confeſſeth that, (11) *Auſtine in his booke againſt the Epiſtle of Donatus, teacheth that the Church was founded vpon Peter, as vpon the*

(8) In pſal. cont. part. Donat. & de Bap. cont. Don l. 2. c. 2.
(9) Ser 3. in feſt. Pet & Pau & ſer. 15. de Sanctis.
Ep. ad Quint.
(10) In pſal. 30. Con. 2.
(11) De Tradit. Apoſt. part. 2. l. 3. Col. 622.

the Rock, and he proueth this his opinion by the verſes of Ambroſe.

(11) *De vnit. Eccleſ.*

S. Cyprian, no leſſe plainly writeth: (12) *Our Lord ſaith to Peter, I ſay to thee that thou art Peter, and vpon that Rock I will build my Church &c.* But to be briefe, the like is taught by the Councell (13) of Calcedon, Origen, Epiphanius, Baſill, and Tertullian.

(11) *Act. 5. Orig. hom. 5. in Exod. Epiph. in Ancorato. Baſil l. 2. in Eunom. Tertul. l. de Præſcript.*

Now that the Fathers thus expounding S. Peter to be the Rocke, did thereby vnderſtand, that the ſupreme care of the whole Church was committed to him, it is euident by S. Chryſoſtome, who interpreting thoſe words, *Thou art Peter*, (14) affirmeth that Chriſt ordained him *Paſtour of the Church*; And that, *the Father placed Hieremy ouer one Nation, but Chriſt placed Peter ouer the whole world*. S. Ambroſe auoucheth that, (15) *Peter is called a Rock, becauſe as an immoueable ſtone he ſuſtayneth the ioyning, and waxght of the whole Chriſtian work* or building. S. Gregory teacheth that, (16) *It is cleer to all that know the Ghoſpell, that by our Lords mouth, the care of the whole Church is committed to holy Peter, the Prince of all the Apoſtles. for to him it is ſayd, (17) Peter loueſt thou me? feed my sheep. To him it is ſayd, (18) Behould Sathan hath deſired to winnow you as wheat, and I haue prayed for thee Peter, that thy fayth may not fayle, and thou ſometymes conuerted, confirme thy Brethren. To whome it is ſaid, (19) Thou art Peter, and vpon this Rock will I build my Church, and the gates of hell ſhall not preuayle againſt it, and to thee I will giue the keyes &c. Behould he taketh the keyes of the Kingdome of heauen, power of binding and looſing is giuen him, the care and principality of the whole Church is committed to him &c.* Theſe ſayings are ſo pregnant, that if Bellarmine were liuing, he could not ſpeake more fauourably for the Popes Primacy. In like ſort whereas Chriſt ſayd to Peter, *Simon loueſt thou me*, and Peter anſwered, *Thou knowest Lord that I loue thee*, and then Ieſus ſayth to him, *feed my sheep*, S. Ambroſe expounding theſe words, ſayth, (20) *Therefore is he preferred before all, becauſe among them all, he alone profeſſed his loue.*

(14) *Ho. 55. in Mat.*

(15) *Ser. 47.*

(16) *L. 4. Ep. 32.*

(17) *Io. 21. 15.*

(18) *Luc. 22. 31.*

(19) *Mat. 16. 18.*

(20) *Ad cap. 24. Lucæ.*

But no man ſpeaketh more expreſſely in this then S. Cyprian, (21) *To Peter our Lord after his Reſurrection ſayd, feed my sheep, and builded his Church vpon him alone, and to him he giueth the charge of feeding his sheep; for although after his Reſurrection, he*

(21) *De vnit. Eccl.*

gaue

gaue his power alike to all, ſaying, As my father ſent me, ſo I ſend you, take the holy Ghoſt, If you remit to any their ſinnes, they ſhall be remitted &c. Yet to manifeſt vnity, he conſtituted one Chayre, and ſo diſpoſed by his authority, that vnity ſhould haue originc of one: The reſt of the Apoſtles were that Peter was in equall fellowſhip of honour & power, but the beginning cōmeth of vnity: the Primacy is giuen to Peter, that the Church of Chriſt may be ſhewed to be one, & one Chaire.

Let vs heare S. Chriſoſtome, (22) *Why did our Lord ſhed his bloud? truly (ſayth he) to redeeme thoſe ſheepe, the care of which he committed both to Peter, and alſo to his Succeſſors.* And a little after, *Chriſt would haue Peter endued with ſuch authority, and to be farre aboue all his other Apoſtles; for he ſayth, Peter doſt thou loue me more then all theſe do? Whereupon our Maiſter might haue inferred, if thou loue me Peter, vſe much faſting, ſleepe on the hard floore, watch much, be Patron to the oppreſſed, Father to the Orphans, and husband to the widdowes: but omitting all theſe things, he ſaith, feed my sheep; for all the foreſaid vertues may eaſily be done by many ſubiects, not only men, but alſo women: but when it commeth to the gouernment of the Church, & committing the Charge of ſo many ſoules, all woman-kind muſt needs wholy giue place to the burden and greatneſſe therof, and a great number of men alſo.* And wheras Chriſt ſaid to S. Peter, *feed my sheep* (23) *What sheep* (ſayth S. Bernard?) *the people of this or that City? of this or that kingdome? My sheep* (quoth he) *to whom is it not manifeſt, he deſigned not ſome, but aſsigned all? nothing is excepted where nothing is diſtinguished.* And the like is taught by S. Chryſoſtome, S. Auſtine, and S. Cyril, vpon this place, and by S. Leo (24) and Maximus.

(22) L. 2. de Sacerdotio.

(23) L. 2. de Conſidera

(24) Ep. 89. ad Epiſcopos Vienenſis Prouinciæ.

S. Auſtine ſpeaking of our Sauiours paying *Tribute* for himſelfe and Peter, interpreteth the words thus, (25) *They that receyued the didrachmes, ſay to Peter the Apoſtle: Your maiſter doth not pay the didrachmes &c. vpon which words they went to the maiſter, that he might pay for all his Diſciples. But our Sauiour when he commandeth to pay for himſelfe and Peter, ſeemeth to haue paid for all: becauſe as in our Sauiour were all the Cauſes of Superiority, ſo after him all are contayned in Peter: for he ordayned him the head of them, that he might be the Paſtour of our Lords flock.* And a little after vpon thoſe words, (26) *I haue prayed for thee that thy fayth fayle not*, he ſayth further: *It is euident that all are contayned*

Max. ſer. de S. Pet. & Pau.

(25) Quæſt. Vet. & noui. Teſt. q. 75.

(26) Luc. 22.

in Peter, for asking for Peter he is knowne to aske for all. Alwayes in the Superiour, the people is reproued, or commended.

S. Hilary writing vpon theſe words, *Goe after me Sathan, thou art a ſcandall to me*, expoundeth them in this manner, (27) *When he had ſpoken certaine things concerning his Paſſion to his Diſciples, and Peter had deteſted this as vnworthy the ſonne of God, Peter, to whom before he had giuen the keies of the kingdome of heauen, vpon whom he was to build his Church, againſt whom the gates of hell ſhould nothing preuayle, who what he either looſed or bound vpon Earth, thoſe ſhould remayne either looſed or bound in heauen; This man deteſting this Sacrament of his Paſſion, he receiued with this reproach, Go after me Sathan, thou art a ſcandall to me: for ſo great was his Religion* (or care) *to ſuffer for the ſaluation of mankind, as that with the reproach of Sathan he named Peter, the firſt Confeſſor of the ſonne of God, the foundation of the Church, the Porter of the kingdome of heauen, and for earthly Iudgment, the Iudge of heauen.*

(27) *In Pſ. 13 2. multo ante med.*

Vpon theſe words of S. Paul, (28) *After three yeares I came to Hieruſalem to ſee Peter*, S. Ambroſe writeth, (29) *It was fitting that he ſhould deſire to ſee Peter, becauſe he was the chiefe among the Apoſtles, to whom our Sauiour had committed the care of Churches.* Yea according to S. Hierome, (30) *Peter was of ſo great authority, that Paul in his Epiſtle writeth, Then after three yeares I came to Hieruſalem to ſee Peter &c. Shewing that he had not ſecurity of Preaching the Ghoſpell, vnles it were confirmed by the ſentence of Peter, and the reſt of the Apoſtles that were with him.* S. Chryſoſtome ſaith hereof, (32) *Peter was the mouth of the Apoſtles, and the Prince and top of that Company, and therfore Paul went to ſee him aboue others.*

(28) *Gal. 1. 18.*

(29) *In Gal. 1.*

(30) *Ep. 89. ad Aug. c. 2.*

(32) *Ho. 87. in Ioan. 21.* See alſo *Oecumenius in Gal. 1.*

Laſtly, wheras in the numbring of the Apoſtles it is ſaid, (33) *The firſt Simon, who is called Peter*, S. Ambroſe ſayth hereof; (34) *Andrew firſt followed our Sauiour before Peter, and yet the Primacy Andrew receiued not, but Peter.* S. Bernard affirmeth, that, (35) *Peter walking vpon the waters, as Chriſt did, declared himſelfe the only Vicar of Chriſt, which ſhould be ruler not ouer one people, but ouer all, for many waters are many peoples.*

(33) *Mat. 10. 2.*

(34) *In 1. Cor. 12.*

(35) *L. 2. de Conſid. c. 8.*

But the Fathers are ſo confeſſedly cleere in their expounding of the Scriptures for S. Peters Primacy ouer all the Apoſtles, and the whole Church, that Danæus for his beſt anſwere

anſwere vnto them, ſayth, (36) *They are not to be believed, for the ſaying of Chriſt, Mat. 16. thou art Peter, and vpon this Rock I will build my Church, moſt badly they expound of the Perſon of Peter.* Agreably alſo confeſſeth Caluin (37) *The Church to be built vpon Peter, becauſe it is ſaid, vpon this Rock &c. Some of the Fathers haue ſo expounded, but the whole Scripture gainſayeth.* And if we will believe D. Fulke, (38) *Many of the Ancient Fathers &c. were deceiued to thinke ſomething more of Peters Prerogatiue, & the Biſhop of Romes dignity, then by the word of God was giuen to either of them.* The Centuriſtes affirme that, (39) *Leo very painfully goeth about to proue that ſingular preheminence was giuen to Peter, aboue the other Apoſtles, and that thence roſe the Primacy of the Roman Church.*

(36) *Reſp. ad Bell. diſp. part. 1. p. 277.*
(37) *Inſtit. l. 4. c. 6. Sect. 6.*
(38) Confut. of the Papiſts Quarrels. p. 4.
(39) *Cent. 5. Col. 1161.*

But Proteſtants forbeare not to reproue, and charge with affected Primacy euen *S. Peter* himſelfe, and the other next ſucceeding to him Biſhops of Rome, for thus write certayne Caluiniſts, (40) *It may not be denyed, but that Peter was ſometymes faulty in ambition and deſire of power &c. By which infirmity of Peter, doubtles it was ſignified that thoſe Biſhops which bragged of Peters ſucceſſion, were to be faulty of the like &c. Wherefore this ſo peruerſe ambition of Peter, and ignorance of heauenly things, and negligence withall &c. did without doubt ſignify, that the Romane Biſhop, becauſe he would be Chiefe, and heire of Peters priuiledges, was to be ignorant and a contemner of heauenly things &c.* To the ſame purpoſe another Prot. ſayth, (41) *The affectation of Primacy, was a common Infirmity of the Apoſtles, as alſo of the firſt Biſhops of the Citty of Rome.*

(40) *Catalogus teſtium veritatis. to. 2. p. 27.*
(41) *Philippus Nicolai in Comment. de regno Dei. p. 222.*

But that you may ſee that this clayme was not onely made by Popes, the Centuriſts confeſſe that, (42) *Tertullian not without Errour (as they dreame) ſeemeth to thinke the keyes to be committed only to Peter, and the Church to be built vpon him.* (43) *Cyprian ſayth euery where the Church to be founded vpon Peter,* (44) *Origen ſayth Tract. 5. in Matth. Peter by promiſe deſerued to be made the foundation of the Church: and Hom. 17. in Luc. he calleth Peter the Prince of the Apoſtles.* (45) Fulke chargeth Optatus *with abſurdity for ſaying of Peter, he deſerued to be preferred before all the Apoſtles, and he alone receiued the keyes of the Kingdome of heauen, to be communicated to the reſt.* So manifeſt it is, that all the Fathers

(42) *Cent. 3. Col. 84.*
(43) *Cent. 3. Col. 84.*
(44) *Cent. 3. Col. 83.*
(45) Retentiue p. 248.

thers of the Primitiue Church, beleeued Peter to be the ſupreme Head of the Church.

SECT. IV.

That Proteſtants alſo do agree with Catholickes, in the Doctrine of S. Peters Primacy.

IOhn Huſſe proueth both by Scriptures and Fathers, that S. Peter was head of the Apoſtles & the whole Church. (1) *The ſaying of B. Dionyſius (ſayth he) is true, that Peter is Chief among the Apoſtles, and was the foundation of Churches; And the ſaying of Auſtine alſo is true, that he was firſt among the Apoſtles, according to ſome Prerogatiue. And the ſaying of Marcellus is true, that Peter was the head of the whole Church &c. There were three vertues in which Peter excelled, fayth, humility, and charity &c, from that fayth Peter receyued the burden of the Rule of the Church: And I ſay to thee, ſayth the Rock, becauſe thou art Peter, and vpon this Rock I will build my Church &c. Peter was the firſt Vicar of Chriſt by him choſen, and deputed ſpiritually to the Church.*

(1) De Eccleſia. c. 9.

(2) *In profeſsione fidei, cap. 38.*

Perzibranes Confeſſion in this point is this, (2) *I confeſſe that the keyes of looſing and bynding, of forgiuing and retayning ſinnes, were giuen by Chriſt to the holy Church in B. Peter principally, and in other Apoſtles.*

D. Biſſon alledging theſe words of Chriſt, *He that is greater among you, let him be as the leaſt*, affirmeth that, (3) *In theſe words the Lord noteth a manifeſt diſtinction of ſome greater, ſome leſſe, ſome chiefer, ſome lower.* D. Sarauia ſaith of the forſaid doubt of the Apoſtles, and our Sauiours ſaid anſwere, (4) *Farre be it from me, that I ſhould rashly condemne thoſe good men of ſacrilegious ambition, ſeing the Lord did not ſo much correct, as diuert them in their demaund.* And the like is taught by D. (5) Whitguift.

(3) *Perpet. Gouern. c. 6. p. 51.*

(4) Diuers degrees of Miniſters. l. 2. c. 21. p. 173. 174.

(5) Def. pag. 70.

Caluin ſpeaking of the change of name from Simon to Cephas, or Peter, ſaith, (6) *The Euangeliſt reciteth as it were this Prophecy, that Simon ſhould haue a new name giuen him. I call it a Prophecy, not only becauſe Chriſt foreſaw the conſtancy of faith which*

(6) *In Ioan. 1. 42.*

which would be in Peter, but becauſe he foreſaw what he would giue him: therfore now he commendeth in words the grace which he reſolued afterwardes to beſtow vpon him. He doth not therfore ſay that this is his name for the preſent, but differreth it to the tyme to come, Thou ſhalt be called Cephas, ſaith he, It is meet that all the Godly be Peters, who founded in Chriſt may be made fit to build the Temple of God: but this one is ſo called for his ſingular Excellency.

D. Whitaker relating what himſelfe and other Prot. thinke heerof, ſayth, (7) *We do not deny Peter to be the foundation of the Church, and the Gouernour, and we will grant, if they ſhall require, that to be promiſed him by Chriſt in theſe words.* And (8) *who doth not confeſſe Peter to be the Rocke and the foundation of Church?* Reynolds acknowledgeth it to be true, (9) *That the words of Chriſt to Peter do containe this ſenſe, vpon thee I will build my Church.* Marcus Antonius de Dominis confeſſeth that, (10) *It is expreſſely ſayd by Chriſt, ſpeaking to Peter, I will giue to thee the keyes. Let them therefore be gone and depart, whoſoeuer offering violence to this Text, do contend that the keyes are giuen or promiſed not to Peter immediatly, but Peters perſon excluded, either to the whole Church, or to another which is not Peter.* Whitaker likewiſe ſaith, (11) *I graunt, that to him (to wit Peter) the keys were truly promiſed, for that the place conuinceth, and I will neuer deny it. Who doubteth* (ſayth D. (12) Andrewes) *that the keyes were giuen to him?* So free from all doubt is S. Peters Primacy.

(7) *Controu. 4. q. 2. pag. 544.*
(8) *Con. Dur. l. 5. ſect. 4.*
(9) *Conſer. Cap. 2. ſec. 2.*
(10) *L. 2. de Repub. c. 7. num. 2.*
(11) *Contron. 4 q. 2. c. 4 p. 557.*
(12) *Reſp. ad Apol. Bellar. c. 8.*

D. Whiteguift alledgeth Caluin to ſay, (13) *The twelue Apoſtles had one among them to gouerne the reſt*; and he proueth it, in that there is, (14) *no Colledge without a Gouernour, no Society without a maiſter*; & hereupon he further concludeth, ſaying, *So ſhould it not be any abſurdity, if we ſhould confeſſe, that the Apoſtles gaue ſuch preheminence to Peter.* Affirming further himſelfe, that, (15) *Among the Apoſtles themſelues, there was one chiefe &c. that had chiefe authority ouer the reſt, that Schiſmes might be compounded.*

(13) Whiteg. Def. p. 171.
(14) *Ibid. p. 409.*
(15) *Ibid.*

Muſculus auoucheth, that, (16) *Celeſtiall ſpirits are not equall &c. The Apoſtles themſelues were not equall, Peter is found in many places to haue bene Chiefe, which we deny not.* But D. Whiteguift is ſo full in this, as that he not only anſwereth (17) certaine places of Scripture, obiected by ſome againſt Peters

(16) In Whiteg. Def. p. 66. 68.
(17) *Ibid. p. 62. 63 65. 68. 70. 495.*

Primacy, but alſo expoundeth (18) in behalfe of the ſame ſundry of the ſaid Scriptures before alleadged. And although he would euade ſomething from our Catholicke Doctrine, by affirming that Peter was only as an Archbiſhop, ouer other Bishops in one Prouince, hauing *Chiefe authority ouer the reſt, to this end eſpecially, that Schiſmes and contentions might be compounded:* yet Cartwright heerto well replyeth, that by the ſame reaſon it neceſſarily followeth, (19) that, *for the keeping of the vniuerſall Church in vnity, there is like neceſſity of one Bishop ouer all Chriſtendome.*

(18) *Ibid. p.* 70.304.

(19) In whiteg. Def. p. 380.

(20) *In reſolutionibus.*

Luther thinketh, (20) *That Peter was firſt in order no man denieth &c. We confeſſe Peter to be the Prince of the Apoſtles, the firſt member of the Church, the head of the Colledge of the Apoſtles, and the reſt which holy Fathers haue ſaid of him.*

(21) Of the Church. l. 5. c. 32.

(22) Ag. the Plea of the Innoc. c. 9. p. 106.

(23) *Ib. p.* 107.

D. Field, (21) *We deny not but that B. Peter had a kind of Primacy and honour.* D. Couell is ſo full herein, that he giueth the true reaſon of this Primacy, for hauing ſpoken of (22) *one aboue the reſt to ſuppreſſe the ſeedes of diſſenſion*, he ſayth further, (23) *If this were the principall meanes to preuent Schiſmes and diſſentions in the Primitiue Church, when the graces of God were far more abundant and eminent then now they are: Nay if the twelue, were not like to agree, except there had beene one Chiefe among them; for ſaith Hierome, among the twelue one was therfore choſen, that a Chiefe being appointed, occaſion of diſſention might be preuented &c.* and then ſpeaking of Puritanes, he vrgeth well, *How can they thinke that equality would keep all the Paſtors in the world in peace and vnity &c. For in all Societies, authority (which cannot be where all are equall) muſt procure vnity and obedience.* Thus far in proofe that Proteſtants do teach from Scriptures, the Primacy of S. Peter.

SECT.

SECT. V.

Obiections from Scripture against S. Peters Primacy answered.

SOme obiect those words of S. Paul, (1) *When Cephas was was come to Antioch, I resisted him in face, because he was reprehensible.* Ergo, Paul was not subiect to him. Answ. An Inferiour may reprehend his Superiour, so that the matter require it, and due reuerence be obserued: and as for the fault heer reproued, Tertullian affirmeth that it was, (2) *Conuersationis, non Praedicationis vitium, a default in Conuersation, lyfe, or regiment, not in doctrine.* And S. Austine, and those that make most of it, thinke no otherwise of it. But S. Hierome and other Fathers deeme it no fault at all, nor any other thing then what (3) S. Paul himselfe did vpon the like occasion, & that this whole combat was a set thing agreed vpon betweene them. It is a schoole point much debated betweene S. Hierome and (4) S. Austine. How soeuer the Ancient Fathers do answere this obiection. S. Cyprian sayth, (5) *For neyther Peter whome our Lord chose the first, and vpon whome he built the Church, when Paul disputed with him of Circumcision, challenged insolently, or arrogantly tooke any thing to himselfe, saying, That he had the Primacy, and therefore the later Disciples ought rather to obey him.* According to S. Austine (6) *That which was done of Paul profitably, by the liberty of Charity, the same Peter tooke in good part by holy and benigne godlines of humility, and so he gaue to posterity a more rare and holy Example, if at any tyme perhaps they did amisse, to be content to be directed by their Iuniors, then Paul to be bould and confident: Yea the inferiours to resist their betters for defending the Truth of the Ghospell, brotherly Charity alwayes preserued.* And see the like answere in (7) S. Hierome and (8) S. Gregory.

(1) Gal. 2. 11.
(2) De Praescript. num. 7.
(3) Act. 21. 26.
(4) Aug. Ep. 9. 11. 19.
(5) Ep 71. ad Quint.
(6) Ep. 19. c. 2. & l. 2. de Bap. c. 2.
(7) In Gal. 2.
(8) Ho. 28. in Ezech.

Reynolds vrgeth that, (9) the Apostles (10) *Which were at Hierusalem, sent Peter and Iohn to the people of Samaria: The Apostles and Brethren that were in Iury, called Peter to an account,* (11)

(9) Conf. c. 4. diuis. 3.
(10) Act. 8. 14.
(11) Act. 11.

when

when he had preached to Cornelius, which ſeeme to argue, that he was not head of the reſt. Anſw. All miſſion doth not ſuppoſe ſuperiority in the ſender, for the holy Ghoſt (12) is ſayd to be ſent from the Father & the Sonne, and yet is inferiour to neyther: ſo alſo fellowes in Colledges, and partners in Incorporations, do by Election, ſend ſome of their Company, equall in authority to the reſt about their affaires. And others are ſent by aduiſe and humble intreaty, as the (13) people of the Iewes ſent Phinees the high Prieſt to the ſonnes of Ruben and Gad. And thus the Councell may ſend the King to vndertake ſome enterpriſe for the good of the Common wealth. And thus was Peter by intreaty ſent to the people of Samaria. And ſo alſo of curteſy, or charity rather, he gaue account why he preached to the Gentiles, by telling the viſion he receiued of gods diuine pleaſure therin, to inſtruct ſuch of the Apoſtles, as doubted whether the tyme were yet expedient to admit the Gentils. Or it may be ſayd, he gaue that account, to free himſelfe from the calumniation of his Enemies, and ſcandall of the Iewes.

(12) Io. 14. 26. & 15. 26.

(13) Ioſue. 22.

It is further vrged, that the firſt Controuerſy aryſing in the Church, was not defyned by any one ſupreme Iudge, but by the Aſſembly of the Apoſtles and Seniors, (14) *The Apoſtles and Ancients aſſembled to conſider of this word*. Anſw. S. Peter, who was the chiefe, was there preſent, who therfore, though S. Iames Biſhop of that Dioceſſe being then preſent, did ſpeake firſt in the Councell; which he durſt not haue done, if he had not been the head thereof: neyther doth it impugne a Monarchicall Gouernement, that things be defyned in a publicke aſſembly, with the common counſaile and conſent of the Princes or chiefe Nobles.

(14) Act. 15. 6.

In like ſort it is obiected, that S. Paul ſayth to Biſhops, (15) *Take heed to your ſelues, and to the whole flocke, wherin the holy Ghoſt hath placed you Biſhops, to rule the Church of God &c.* And the like ſayth (16) S. Peter. Anſw. It is not denyed, but that Biſhops and Prieſts are to feed and rule the Church, euery one being to take particular care & charge of the people committed vnto him: but the queſtion is, of the chiefe power ouer the whole Church, for which the forſaid places inforce nothing.

(15) Act. 20. 28.

(16) 1. Pet. 5. 1. 2.

Others

Others obiect that Chriſt alone is a head ſufficient for the gouernment of the whole Church, and therefore no neceſſity that S. Peter, or any Pope ſhould be eſteemed as head of the vniuerſall Church vpon Earth. Anſw. Chriſt alone as our Supreme Lord and King, is ſufficient to gouerne all Empires, Kingdomes, Cittyes, armies, families, and flocks: and yet therefore we muſt not inferre, that Emperours are to be driuen out of their Empyres, Kings out of their kingdomes, Gouernours out of Cittyes, Commanders from their Armies, Mayſters from their families, and ſhepheards from their flockes: wherefore in this as in ſundry other things, we are to conſider the ſweet courſe of Gods Prouidēce, who vſeth the concurrence of ſecondary cauſes in the productiō, adminiſtration, and preſeruation of things. So that as he vſeth the Sunne, the Ayre, the Raine, the Earth, as ſecondary cauſes and inſtruments for our corporall nouriſhment; ſo doth he vſe man, as his Inſtrument, to inſtruct vs in fayth, to feed vs with his Sacraments, and to be our Gouernour and Commaunder in matters ſpirituall. And though it be moſt true, that Chriſt is the chiefe Head or Rocke of the Church, yet that S. Peter in a good ſenſe might alſo be a head or Rocke, S. Baſil doth teach vs ſaying, (17) *Though Peter be a Rocke, he is not a Rock as Chriſt is, for Chriſt is the true immoueable Rocke of himſelfe, Peter is vnmoueable by Chriſt the Rock: for Ieſus doth communicate and impart his dignities, not voyding himſelf of them, but houlding them to himſelfe, beſtoweth them alſo vpon others*: (18) *He is the light, and yet you are the lights, he is the Prieſt, and yet* (19) *he maketh Prieſts, he is the Rocke, and he made a Rock.* So weake are the Obiections which Prot. take from Scriptures.

(17) L. de Pœnit.

(18) Mat. 5. 14.

(19) Luc. 22. 19.

CHAP. IX.

The true State of the Queſtion, concerning the Biſhop of Rome his Primacy, in matters Eccleſiaſticall.

Whether the Primacy giuen by Chriſt to S. Peter was giuen alſo to his Succeſſours: & whether the Biſhops of Rome be the ſayd Succeſſours.

SECT. I.

Catholike Doctrine.

THAT the Primacy giuen to S. Peter, was to continue to his Succeſſors the Biſhops of the Roman Sea, the Catholike Church doth conſtantly belieue. The Councell of Trent teacheth that, (1) *Popes deſeruedly in regard of the Chiefeſt authority giuen them in the whole Church, might reſerue ſome more grieuous Criminall cauſes to their owne peculiar Iudgement.* The Church in the Profeſſion of our fayth directeth vs to ſay, (2) *I acknowledge the holy Catholike, and Apoſtolike Romane Church, the mother and Miſtres of all Churches,* and *&c. the Romane Biſhop, the Succeſſor of S. Peter, the Prince of the Apoſtles, and the Vicar of Ieſus-Chriſt.*

(1) Seſſ. 24. c. 7.

(2) Bulla Pij 4. ſuper forma Iuramenti Profeſſionis fidei.

The Decree of the Fathers of the Councell of Florence

wa

was this, (3) *We define the holy Apoſtolicke Sea, and the Biſhop of Rome to haue Primacy ouer the whole world, and that the Biſhop of Rome is the Succeſſor of B. Peter, Prince of the Apoſtles, and the true Vicar of Chriſt, and the head of the whole Church, and the Father & teacher of all Chriſtians, and that to him in S. Peter full power was giuen by our Lord Ieſus Chriſt, of feeding and gouerning the vniuerſall Church, euen as it is contayned in the Actes of generall Councels, and in the ſacred Canons.* This decree was made by the conſent both of the Greeke and Latin Fathers preſent in that Councell. (3) *Seſſ. vlt.*

In the very Councell of Baſill it was acknowledged, that, (4) *the Pope was head and Primate of the Church, the Vicar of Chriſt, and the Prelate and Paſtour of Chriſtians: from Chriſt, not from men or other Synods, to him are giuen by our Lord the keyes, & to one it is ſaid, Thou art Peter; and he alone is called into the fulnes of power, others into part of the care &c. Theſe thinges we plainly confeſſe and beleeue, and do intend to giue our diligence in this Councell, that all may beleeue the ſame.* (4) *Reſponſ. Synod. de authorit. Conc. general.*

In the firſt Nicene Councell it is ſaid, (5) *He who bouldeth the ſea of Rome, is the head and Chiefe of all the Patriarches, ſeing he is the firſt (or chiefe) as Peter, to whom power is giuen ouer all Chriſtian Princes, and all their people, as he who is the Vicar of Chriſt our Lord ouer all people, and the vniuerſall Church of Chriſt, and whoſoeuer ſhall contradict this, is excommunicated by the Synod.* (5) *Can. 39. Arab.*

In the Councell of Epheſus, Pope Celeſtine is called *S. Peters* (6) *Succeſſor, and he that bouldeth his place.* And in the Councell of Laterane it is taught, that, (7) *The Roman Church by our Lords Ordinance hath Principality of ordinary power aboue all others, as being the Mother and Miſtres of all Chriſtian Beleiuers.* (6) *Part. 2. Act. 3.* (7) *Conc. Later. ſub Innoc. 3. c. 3.*

In the ſecond Councell of Nice it was decreed, that, (8) *Bleſſed Peter Prince of the Apoſtles, who firſt gouerned the Apoſtolicke Sea, did leaue the Principality of his Apoſtleſhip and Paſtorall care to his Succeſſours, who are to ſit for euer in his moſt ſacred ſea; To which ſucceſſors Biſhops he gaue and deliuered by Commandement from God the power of authority, euen as it was granted to him by our Saiuour &c.* And the ſame Primacy of the Biſhop of Rome, and his ſucceſſion to S. Peter, is taught by all Catholicke (9) writers of theſe tymes. (8) *Act. 2.* (9) *Bellar. de Rom. Pont. l. 2 c. 12. Khem. Teſt. in Io. 12. 17.*

Points not defyned.

(10) Pighius Hierarch. Eccl. l. 4. c. 8.
(11) Turrecrem. l. 4. par. 2. c. 20.
(12) Caietan. Tract. de authorit. Papæ & Conc. c. 20. 21.
(13) Driedo de Script. & Eccl. dogm. l. 4. c. 2. p. 2.
Sent. 2. Canus de locis. l. 4. c. 1. Bellar. de Rom. Pont. l. 2. c. 30.
(14) Canus de locis. l. 6. c. 4. 5. & Driedo de variis dogm. c. 4. part. 3. Turrecrem. de Eccl. l. 2. c. 40.
(15) Sotus l. 4. Sent. dist. 24. q. 2. Art. 5.
(16) In colloquiis Latinis. Tom. 2. cap. de Papistis.
(17) L. aduers. ius Papatum Romæ fundatum.

Some (10) probably teach that the Pope cannot be an Hereticke, and consequently that he cannot in any case be deposed. (11) Others, that the Pope falling into heresy, though only interiour, is therby out of the Church and deposed by God, & for such may be declared by the Church. Others (12) that the Pope being a manifest hereticke, is not thereupon deposed, but may & ought to be by the Church. Others (13) and most probably, that the Pope if he be a manifest hereticke, doth therby of himselfe desist to be Pope & head, euen as he ceaseth to be a Christian and member of the body of the Church, and so may be iudged and punished by the Church.

Some (14) teach most probably, that by Christs Institution, the Bishop of Rome is, and so euer to continue, the successour of S. Peter in the care of the Vniuersall Church. Others (15) affirme, that this Succession in the Sea of Rome, is only annexed by authority of the Church, & therfore by the same authority may be remoued to the Bishop of another Diocesse, or to belong to no Diocesse determinatly, but to be an vniuersall Pastor of the vniuersall Church. But none of these are defyned by the Church.

Protestants Vntruthes.

Luther is not ashamed to say, that, (16) *The Pope teacheth foolishly Christes Priesthood, to be translated to the Pope the Vicar of Christ, denying the Eternall Priesthood of Christ. Looke only vpon two Chapters of his Decretals, where with great Maiesty he extolleth himselfe aboue the authority of Scripture. In expounding them he giueth place to the Fathers, in defyning Causes, he preferreth the Authority of the Apostolicke sea, because he wilbe Lord of Scripture, not iudged by it.* And in a Booke which he wrote but a yeare before his death, he affirmeth the Pope to say, (17) *No man without me, my keyes and Masses can giue help; Christ and faith here can helpe nothing.* Againe, *Christ is drunke, foolish, mad, and forgetfull how great*

powr

power of bynding with keyes he hath giuen me. Alſo, *he that doth not adore the Cracket of my belly committeth mortall ſinne, and is worthy of hell.* Yea he ſeriouſly affirmeth, that the Pope & all that adhere vnto him, do know nothing in the Scriptures, nothing of God, of Chriſt, of Baptiſme, of the Euchariſt, of the keyes, of good workes, and that without doubt no Catholicke knoweth any one of the 10. Commandements, or one Petition of the Lords Prayer, or any article of the Creed. But theſe are ouer groſſe to confute.

Chemnitius followeth his lying Father, auouching that, (18) *The Fathers of the Councell ſay, that the Pope hath will for reaſon in thoſe thinges which he willeth, that he may change the forme of Sacraments deliuered from the Apoſtles, that he may decree contrary to the Epiſtles of Paul, that he may diſpenſe againſt the 4. firſt Councels, and againſt the words of the Ghoſpell.* And this is as true, as if a man ſhould ſay that Chemnitius were not a moſt impudent lyar, forger, and deceyuer. (18) *Exam. Concil. Trid.* See the like *in Illiricus de forma & praxi Concil. Trident.*

Rogers auoucheth Catholickes to belieue, (19) *that the Pope is God, in that he can at his pleaſure diſcharge guilty ſoules, both from the guilt of ſinne, and from the punishment due for the ſame.* Inſteed of this which Catholickes vtterly deny, they do indeed auouch that Luther, Rogers, and other Prot. writers, are knowne to be moſt lying Companions. (19) Defence of the Art. art. 22. p. 122.

Our Engliſh Prot. Church hath decreed, that, (20) *The Queenes Maieſty hath the chiefe power in this Realme of England, & other her Dominions, vnto whom the chiefe Gouernment of all Eſtates of this Realme, whether they be Eccleſiaſticall or Ciuill, in all cauſes doth appertayne, and is not, or ought to be ſubiect to any foraigne Iuriſdiction &c. The Biſhop of Rome hath no Iuriſdiction in this Realme of England.* (20) *Art.* 37.

Other Prot. deny this, affirming that the Church hath no other Head but Chriſt alone, for ſo the Heluetian Prot. ſay, (21) *We hould and teach that Chriſt our Lord is, and remayneth ſtill, the only vniuerſall Paſtor, and higheſt Biſhop before God his Father, and that in the Church he performeth all the dutyes of a Paſtour or Biſhop euen to the worlds end: and therfore ſtandeth not in need of any other to ſupply his roome, for he is ſaid to haue a ſubſtitute, who is abſent: but Chriſt is preſent with his Church, and is the head that giueth* (21) Harm. of Confeſſ pag. 309.

ueth life thereunto. He did ſtraigbtly forbid his Apoſtles and their Succeſors all Superiority or Dominion in the Church. Againe, (22) *We acknowledge no other head of the Church then Chriſt.* And, (23) *We do not allow of the Doctrine of the Romiſh Prelates, who would make the Pope their generall Paſtour, and ſupreme Head of the Church of Chriſt militant here on Earth, and the very Vicar of Chriſt.* So that according to theſe good fellowes, not only the Pope, but alſo all Temporall Princes, are reiected from all Headſhip or Superiority in the Church, this being reſerued only to Chriſt himſelfe: And yet it is (24) not long ſince they denied it to Chriſt himſelfe, as man.

(22) *Ib.* 110.
(23) Ib. 308.
(24) See before Ch. 8. ſec. 1.
(25) See *Athanaſ Ep. ad ſolitar. vitam agentes. Ambr. Ep.* 82. 83. *Zozom. l.* 6. *c.* 7. *Aug. Ep.* 48. 50. 162. 165. *Conc.* 3. *Carth. g. Can.* 9.
(26) *Cent.* 4. *Col.* 549. *Polanus in Symphon. pa.* 836. *& Oſiand. Cent.* 4. *pag.* 477. *Cart. in Whitg. Def. p.* 700.
(27) *Synod.* 8. *Can.* 22. *Conc. Roman* 2. *&* 3. *Platina in Nicolao.* 1.
(28) *Baron. An.* 313. *n.* 30.
(29) *Seſſ* 8. *&* 25.
(30) *In Aſſert. Tom.* 2. *Art.* 30.

Proteſtants agree with ancient Heretickes.

The Clayme of Eccleſiaſticall Primacy was condemned in the Emperour Conſtantius, to whom the Catholicke Biſhop Oſius ſaid, (25) *Do not intermedle in Eccleſiaſticall affaires, neither command vs in this kind, but rather learne thoſe things from vs. God hath committed the Empyre to you, and to vs thoſe things which belong to the Church &c. Take heed leaſt drawing vnto you ſuch things as concerne the Church, you be guilty of great crime &c.* And againe, *Who ſeeing him in decreeing to make himſelfe the Prince of Biſhops, and to be Chiefe Iudge in Eccleſiaſticall Iudgments, will not iuſtly ſay, That he is that Abbomination of Deſolation, which was foretould by Daniel.*

The Centuriits alſo cõfeſſe that (26) *Emperours ſo metimes vnſittingly aſſumed to themſelues the Iudgement of matters of fayth, which thing Athanaſius reprehendeth in Conſtantius, and Ambroſe in Valentinian.* The ſame (27) Error is condemned in Photius Patriarch of Conſtantinople. And (28) Donatus the hereticke condemned by Pope Melchiades, appealed to the Emperour. Wicliffe and Huſſe for denying the Popes Primacy were condemned by the (29) Councell of Conſtance. So directly do Proteſtants iumpe with Ancient Heretickes.

Proteſtants Errors.

Luthers Error was, that, (30) *Although S. Peter ſhould gouerne*

serue at this day at Rome, I will deny (sayth he) *the Bishop of Rome to be Pope. For the Pope is a thing faigned in the world, neythes was, nor is, nor shalbe, but faigned to be.* And, (31) *I permit that the Pope make Articles of fayth &c. as are, The bread and wine to be transubstantiated in the Sacramẽt: the essence of God neyther to beget, nor to be begotten: The soule to be the substantiall forme of mans body: Himselfe to be the Emperour of the world, and the King of heauen & God vpon Earth: the soule to be immortall, and all those infinite Monsters in the Roman dunghill of decrees; that such as his fayth is, such be his Ghospell, and such the fayth full, and such the Church.* And he placeth in the Margent, *Articles made by the Pope.* Swinglius also disliketh the Bishop of Rome, in that, (32) *He hath decreed that the soules* (of men) *do not dye, when the body is extinguished.* Who professing Christianity would hold in themselues such Atheisticall opinions, and condemne in others such certayne and generally receyued truthes?

(31) *Ibid Art. 17.*

(32) *De vera & falf. Relig. c. de clauis. To. 2. fol. 187.*

SECT. II.

It is proued from Scriptures and reason, that the Primacy giuen to S. Peter, was giuen also to his Successours: & that the Bishops of Rome are the sayd Successours.

THE first Argument in proofe that the Primacy giuen to S. Peter was likewise to be deriued to his Successours, and in them to continue vntill the end of the world, is taken from the Old Testament, where we fynd, that for the Synagogue of the Iewes, God still prouided one supreme Pastour, by whose authority Controuersies might be decyded. So to (1) Aaron succeeded Eleazarus, and to (2) Eleazarus Phinees, and so of the rest: now we may not thinke, that the loue and care of God towards his Church, is lesse then was to the Synagogue.

(1) *Num. 20. 28.*

(2) *Iud. 20. 28.*

Neyther doth it suffice to answere with (3) Caluin, that the Synagogue, as also the Church in S. Peters tyme was contayned in a litle compasse, and therfore though one Pastour was as then expedient, yet not so would it now be, the

(3) *Inst. l. 4. c. 7.*

the Church being diſperſed all ouer the world. Euen as if the tillage of one or two fields may conueniently be committed to the Care of one husbandman, would it thereupon follow, that the tillage of the fields of the whole world, might commodiouſly be committed to his Charge? This I ſay is impertinent, for the more diſperſed the Church is, the more danger of diſſentions, and thereby the more need of one Paſtour, by whoſe authority Contentions may be compoſed: prooſe whereof may be the irreconciliable or euerlaſting diſſentions amongſt Proteſtants, by not acknowledging one ſupreme Paſtour. The example alſo of the husbandman proueth nothing, for though he alone cannot till all the fields in the world, yet the ſupreme Paſtour of the Church, whoſe authority is ſpirituall, by committing to Inferiour Officers ſo much power as is ſufficient for them, may well gouerne the ſame: yea it maketh as much agaynſt the Biſhops of ſeuerall Dioceſſes, for neyther can one husbandman till all the fields in one Prouince.

(4) Io. vlt. 15.

The ſame neceſsity of one Paſtour euer to continue, is further proued two ſeuerall wayes out of thoſe wordes of Chriſt to S. Peter (4) *Feed my sheep*: firſt heerby he ordayned the Office of a Paſtour, which is an Office ordinary & perpetuall; for as the nature of the thing requireth, ſo long the Office of the Paſtour muſt continue, as the fould or Sheepcote doth continue. Now this being the Church of Chriſt, doth and muſt continue vntill the end of the world: and Saint Peter being long ſince departed out of this world, cannot as now feed the ſame in his owne perſon, therefore it muſt be done by his Succeſſours. Secondly in that he ſayth, *my sheep*, which euen vntill the end of the world will make one fould; now theſe, Peter being dead cannot by himſelfe feed. And therefore S. Chriſoſtome demaunding, (5) *Why Chriſt shed his bloud?* anſwereth himſelfe that, *It was to gayne that flocke, the care whereof he committed to Peter, and to Peters Succeſſours.* Accordingly ſayth S. Leo, (6) *Peter continueth and liueth in his Succeſſours.*

(5) *De ſacerd. l. 2 init.*

(6) *Ser. 2. de Anniuerſ. Aſſumpt ſuæ ad Pontificatum.*

Agayne the Office of ſupreme Paſtour was giuen to Peter for the good of the Chuch, according to that of S. Auſtine

ſtine. (7) *In that we are Chriſtians, it is for our ſelues, in that we are Prelates* (or Superiours) *it is for you.* Now this good, is the preſeruing of the Church in vnity, as (8) S. Hierome teacheth; but in the Church there are now more Chriſtians and worſe then in the tyme of the Apoſtles, therefore there is the like, or greater neceſſity of one ſupreme Paſtour.

(7) *L. de Paſtoribus c. 2.*
(8) *L. 1. cont. Iouin. Cypr. l. de vnit. Eccl. Optatus l. 2. cont. Parmen.*

The Church is *one body*, which beſides Chriſt hath a certayne head vpon Earth, as appeareth by S. Paul, who after he had taught the Churches to be one body, annexeth, (9) *The head cannot ſay to the feet, you are not neceſſary for me*; which cannot be vnderſtood of Chriſt our head, for he may truly ſay vnto vs all, you are not neceſſary for me: But no other head can be aſſigned then S. Peter, and Peter dying, the body of the Church cannot be without a head, therfore ſom man muſt ſucceed him. Laſtly, all arguments that proue the beſt gouernment to be monarchicall, proue alſo this.

(9) *1 Cor. 12. 21.*

Now, that the ſupreme Paſtour ſucceeding S. Peter is the Biſhop of Rome, is proued firſt, in that there was neuer any one who affirmed himſelfe to be the ſucceſſor of Peter, or for ſuch was accompted by others, but only the Biſhop of Rome, & the Biſhop of Antioch. Now the Biſhop of Antioch ſucceeded not S. Peter in the gouernemēt of the whole Church, for ſucceſſion to any is not but to him that yieldeth his place, eyther by naturall death, or by depoſition, or giuing vp of the ſame: whereas S. Peter yet liuing, & bearing rule himſelfe, left the Church of Antioch, & placed his Sea at Rome, where he likewiſe dyed. Beſides the Biſhop of Antioch, had neuer but the third (10) place amongſt the Patriarches, neyther euer ſought he for a higher, whereas the Succeſſour of Peter was doubtles to haue the firſt.

(10) *Conc. Nicæn. Can. 6.*

Secondly, the hiſtories of all ages do teſtify, that the Biſhop of Rome hath exerciſed authority ouer all other Biſhops euen in forraine Nations, as by creating them himſelfe, by confirming them created by others, by depoſing them, by reſtoring them being depoſed by others, by appointing them his Vicars, by finall decyding their Controuerſies, by accepting their appeales, by making lawes ouer all the Church, by diſpenſing in them, by inflicting his

Censures, by being President in Generall Councels and the like; All which do plainly proue him the supreme Pastour of the Church.

SECT. III.

That the Fathers expound the Scriptures in proofe of the Bishop of Rome his succeeding S. Peter in the Primacy of the whole Church.

GElasius affirmeth, that (11) *The Romane Church is preferred before other Churches, not by any Constitutions of Councels, but she obtayned Primacy by the Euangelicall voyce of our Lord, saying, thou art Peter, and vpon this Rocke &c.* The Centuriis say of Gelasius, *that* (12) *he contendeth the Church of Rome by Gods law (iure diuino) to be the first (or chiefe) of all.*

(11) *In Decretis cum 70. Episcopis.*
(12) *Cent. 5. Col. 1274.*

S. Hierome writing to Pope Damasus saith, (13) *I being a sheepe, do require from the Priest the Hoste of Saluation, and from the Pastor safeguard &c. I speake with the successour of the fisher &c. I following none first but Christ, am ioyned in Communion to thy Holinesse, that is, to the Chaire of Peter; vpon that Rock I know the Church to be builded: whosoeuer out of this house eateth the Lambe, is prophane; whosoeuer shall not be in the Arke of Noe, shall perish in the deluge.* Here S. Hierome acknowledgeth Pope Damasus to be the successour of S. Peter, and his Chaire, or Sea, to be the Chaire of Peter.

(13) *p. 59. ad Damas.*

S. Austine vseth against heretickes, this Argument of the Bishop of Rome his succeeding S. Peter, saying, (14) *If the Order of Bishops succeeding one another be to be considered, how much more certainly & indeed safely, do we number from Peter himselfe, to whom bearing the figure of the whole Church, our Lord said, Vpon this Rock I will build my Church. For Linus succeeded to Peter, &c. Damasus to Liberius, Siricius to Damasus, Anastasius to Siricius. In this order of succession no Donatist is found.* And writing to Pope Innocentius, he saith, *We* (15) *thinke &c. that by the authority of thy Holines, deriued from the authority of holy Scriptures, that they will more easily yield, who beleeue such peruerse and pernicious things:* So attributing the Popes authority to the Scriptures

(14) *Ep. 165.*
(15) *Ep. 92.*

tures themſelues. Againe, (16) *Shall we doubt to hyde our ſelues in the boſome of that Church, which &c. from the Apoſtolicall ſea by ſucceſſion of Biſhops hath obtayned the height of authority; To which not to giue the Primacy, is truly either the greateſt impiety, or headlong arrogancy.*

(16) *De vtilitate credendi c.17.*

Yea he teacheth further, that, (17) *Although any Traytor in thoſe tymes, had crept into that rancke of Biſhops, which is continued from Peter himſelfe to Anaſtaſius, who now ſitteth in the ſame Chaire, it would not hurt the Church and innocent Chriſtians: for whom our Lord prouiding, ſaith of euill Paſtours, what they ſay, do you, but what they do, do you not.* Lastly, this wholeſome Counſaile he giueth to all Hereticks, (18) *Come ye Brethren if you will be ingraffed in the vyne, it is a griefe when we ſee you cut of ſo to lye. Number the Prieſtes from the Sea of Peter, and ſee in that Rancke of Fathers who ſucceedeth another: that is the Rock which the proud gates of hell do not vnercome.*

(17) *Ep.165.*

(18) *In Pſal. cons. part. Donati verſus finem.*

S. Bernard writing to Pope Eugenius, amongſt many other excellent thinges, ſaith thus: (19) *Thou alone art not only the Paſtour of sheepe but alſo of all Paſtours. Thou demaundeſt how I proue this? Out of the word of our Lord. For to whom, I do not ſay of Biſhops, but alſo of the Apoſtles, were all the sheepe ſo abſolutely and indeterminately committed? Peter if thou loue me, feed my sheep, which? the people of this or that City, Country or kingdome? He ſayth my sheepe. To whom is it not playne, that he did not aſsigne ſome, but all? nothing is excepted, where nothing is diſtinguished &c. To conclude, Iames who ſeemed a Pillar of the Church was content with only Hieruſalem yielding the vniuerſality to Peter.*

(19) *De Conſider. l. 3. ca. 8. & Ep. 190. ad Innoc. PP.*

The Fathers are ſo manifeſt for the B. of Romes Primacy, that D. Bilſon affirmeth, that, (20) *The ancient and learned Fathers call the Roman Biſhop, Peters Succeſſour.* The Centuriſts ſay of S. Leo, (21) *Leo very payneſully goeth about to proue that ſingular preheminence was giuen to Peter aboue the other Apoſtles, and that thence roſe the Primacy of the Roman Church.* But to be briefe, (22) *We plainly confeſſe* (ſayth Bucer) *that among the antient Fathers, the Romane Church obtayned Primacy aboue others, as that which hath the Chayre of S. Peter, & whoſe Biſhops haue almoſt alwayes bene accounted the Succeſſours of Peter.* So confeſſedly doth the B. of Rome ſucceed S. Peter in the Apoſtolicall Chaire.

(20) True Differ. part. 1 p. 143.

(21) *Cent. 5. Col. 1101.*

(22) *In Præparatoriis ad Concilium.* And ſee this in Chemnitius *de falſa & vera Relig. l. 3.*

SECT. IIII.

That ſundry of the learnedſt Proteſtants do acknowledge, and teach the Primacy of the Roman Biſhop.

OVr very Puritanes do acknowledge and approue from Scriptures, (1) *The high Prieſt of the Iewes was Typically & in a figure the ſupreme head of the whole Catholike Church: which though (ſay they) it were viſible only in the Prouince and nation of Iewry; yet thoſe of other Nations and Countries (as appeareth by the hiſtory of the Actes, euen though they were Æthiopians) were vnder this high Prieſt, and acknowledged homage vnto him. So that he was not a Prouinciall Metropolitan, but in very deed an Oecumenicall and vniuerſall Biſhop of the whole world &c. And therfore the Pope of Rome who alone maketh clayme vnto, and is in poſſeſſion of the like vniuerſall Supremacy, hath more warrant in the word of God to the ſame, then any Metropolitan, or Dioceſan, not dependant vpon him, hath or can haue. So that by the word of God, eyther there muſt be no Metropolitanes and Dioceſans, or elſe there muſt be a Pope.* Heereof alſo ſayth Carwright, (2) *the high Prieſt was the head Prieſt ouer all the whole Church, which was during his tyme vnto our Sauiour Chriſt, and that therefore if by this Example we will haue an Archbiſhop, he muſt be ſuch a one as ſhall gouerne the whole Church.* The Centuriſts confeſſe that, (3) *In the Church of the Iewes there was by Gods Law one only Chiefe Prieſt, whom all were inforced to acknowledge, and to obey him.* And the ſame is acknowledged by (4) Caluin.

(1) English Puritaniſme. p. 16.

(2) In Whiteg. Def. p. 428.

(3) Cen. 1. l. 1. c. 7.

(4) Inſt. l. 4. c. 6. §. 8.

Wicliffe ſubmitteth his faith to the B. of Rome, as to the Chiefe Vicar of Chriſt, ſaying, (5) *I am plainly glad to diſcouer to euery one my faith, and ſpecially to the B. of Rome, becauſe I ſuppoſe that if it be orthodoxall, he will humbly confirme my faith, and if it be erroneous, he will amend it.* &c. *I ſuppoſe alſo that the B. of Rome, ſeeing he is the chiefe Vicar of Chriſt vpon Earth* &c.

(5) Ep. ad Vrban. Sextum apud Foxum. l. 1. Comment.

Perzibran the Huſſites Confeſſion is this, (6) *I profeſſe with a faithfull hart and mouth, that with all my will and deſire, I am in hope and deſire to be indeed wholy, inuiolably, and inſeparably, a member of the holy Mother the Catholicke, Vniuerſall, and Roman Church,*

(6) In Profeſſione fidei

Church, ſpread ouer the whole world, founded in the Apoſtolicall Seas by B. Peter, Prince of the Apoſtles, and continued vnſtill this tyme, and ſo firmly ſtrengthened vpon the firme Rock, that the gates of hell cannot any wayes preuayle againſt it.

Huſſe himſelfe ſayth, (7) *We are not to beleiue in the Pope, or the authority of the Pope; but we are to beleiue, that the Pope is the immediate Vicar of Ieſus Chriſt, & the Cheefe Prieſt here vpon Earth, by reaſon of his Office &c. hauing authority to abſolue and excommunicate, to giue Indulgences, and laſtly of doing other things which belong to the keyes.* In ſo much that in Luthers (8) opinion, *Huſſe ſeemeth not to withſtand, but that there may be the Monarchy of the Pope.* And Luther reproueth him, for that, (9) *He did not reſiſt the Popes Monarchy, but did attribute too much to the Roman Idoll.* M. Iohnſon alſo ſayth; (10) *Did not Iohn Huſſe, that worthy Champion of Chriſt, and others alſo of the Martyrs in former tymes ſay and beare Maſſe, euen to their dying day &c? Did not diuers of them acknowledge, ſome the Popes calling and Supremacy &c?* Morgenſtern confeſſeth, that, (11) *Theſe thinges were pardonable in the godly, who held the Pope to be the Vicar of Chriſt, and the head of the Church, the Papacy for the Church &c.*

(7) *Queſtione de Credere, f. 170.*

(8) *In Aſſert. art. 30.*

(9) *Ibid.*

(10) *In Iacobs Defence &c. p. 21.*

(11) *De Eccleſia p. 41.*

Luther yet himſelfe affirmeth, that (12) *Whereas God would haue one Catholike Church throughout the whole world, it is neceſſary to haue one people; yea and of this one people one Father ought to be choſen.* But yet more particularly he writeth to Pope Leo, thus, (13) *Wherefore moſt bleſſed Father, I offer my ſelfe proſtrate at the feete of thy Holynes with all that I am, and haue. Quicken, kill, call, recall, approue, reproue: I will acknowledge thy voyce, the voice of Chriſt ruling and ſpeaking in thee.* And in proofe of the Popes Primacy, he further ſayth, (14) *The firſt thing that moueth me that the Biſhop of Rome is afore all others &c. is the very will of God, which we ſee in that fact, for the Biſhop of Rome could neuer haue come into this Monarchy, without the will of God, but the will of God, howſoeuer it be knowne, is to be receyued with reuerence: & therfore it is not lawfull rashly to reſiſt the Biſhop of Rome in his Primacy. This reaſon is ſo great, that though there were no other cauſe, yet this were ſufficient to repreſſe the rashnes of thoſe who reſiſt.* And cyted to Auguſta before Cardinall Caietan the Popes Legate, he left this Proteſtation written: *I Martin Luther an Auguſtine*

(12) *Loc. com. claſſ. 1. c. 37.*

(13) *In reſolutionibus priorum Diſput. ad Leonem decimum.*

(14) *In reſolutionibus aliarum propoſitionum.*

Friar do proteſt to reuerence and follow the holy Roman Church, in all my ſayings and deeds, preſent, paſt, and to come. But if any thing hath, or ſhalbe ſpoken contrary or otherwiſe, I do, and will haue it for not ſpoken. A good proteſtation, but badly performed.

(15) *Centuria Epiſtol. Ep. 74. p. 244.*
(16) *Ibid. p. 245.* And in Schluſſelb. catal. hæret. l. 13. p. 633.

Melanchthon doth acknowledge, that, (15) *As certayne Bishops are preſident ouer certayne Churches,* (ſo) *the Bishop of Rome is Preſident ouer all Bishops; And this Canonicall Policy,* (ſayth he, *no wiſe man doth, or ought to diſallow &c. For,* (ſaith he further (16) *the Monarchy of the Bishop of Rome is profitable to this end, that conſent of Doctrine may be retayned: wherefore an agreement may eaſily be eſtabliſhed in this Article of the Popes Primacy, if other Articles could be agreed vpon.*

(17) Ag the Plea of the Innoc. p. 108.

And whereas I proued before, that S. Peter was head or Chiefe of the Apoſtles, and of the whole Church, D. Couell very pertinently ſayth, *If* (17) *it conterne all perſons & ages in the Church of Chriſt (as ſurely it doth) the gouernment muſt not ceaſe with the Apoſtles, but ſo much of that authority muſt remayne to them, who from tyme to tyme, are to ſupply that Charge.* And D. Downham ſpeaking of the Apoſtles and their tymes, teacheth that, (18) *The authority which they had &c. was not to end with their perſons, but to be continued in their Succeſſours.* Hence with great reaſon D. Field teacheth that, (19) *Peter had a kind of Primacy of honour and order, that in reſpect therof, as all Metropolitanes do ſucceed him &c. ſo the Patriarches yet more eſpecially, and amongſt them the Roman Bishops in the firſt place &c. as being chiefe for order ſake, and to preſerue vnity, and in ſuch ſort that all things muſt take their beginning from him.* And (20) *we willingly confeſſe the Roman Church to haue herein Order and honour, the firſt and chiefeſt of all Churches.* Yet more, (21) *He that is in order firſt among the Patriarches with the Synods of Bishops ſubiect to him, may call the reſt together, as being the Principall part of the Church, whence all actions of this nature take beginning.* And laſtly ſayth he, (22) *It is euident &c. that the Bishop of Rome as firſt in Order among the Patriarches,* (*aſſiſted with his owne Bishops, and the Bishops of him that is thought faulty,*) *may iudge any of the other Patriarches, that ſuch as haue complaintes againſt them may flye to him and the Synods of Bishops ſubiect to him, and that the Patriarches themſelues in their diſtreſſes may flye to him, and ſuch Synods for re-*

(18) In his Sermon at Lambeth p. 70. Saraiia in his diuers degrees of Miniſt. c. 16. p. 44.
(19) Of the Church. l. 5. c. 31 p. 166. 167.
(20) *Ibid. c. 35. p. 189.*
(21) *Ibid. c. 52. p. 408.*
(22) *Ib. p. 243.*

lieſe

lieſe &c. By all which it appeareth that the Roman Biſhop is confeſſedly the true Succeſſor of S. Peter, & the ſupreme Paſtor, or Head of the vniuerſall Church.

SECT. V.

Obiections taken from Scripture againſt the Popes Primacy, anſwered.

SOme obiect thoſe words of Chriſt our Sauiour ſpoken to Pilate, (1) *Thou ſhouldeſt not haue any power againſt me, vnles it were giuen thee from aboue*; wherby it ſeemeth that Imperiall power was giuen by God againſt him: and therfore much more the Pope, who termeth himſelfe the Vicar of Chriſt, ought to be ſubiect to the power of Emperours & Princes. Anſw. No man can dreame, that Chriſt who was God, & the ſonne of God, was by right or any law ſubiect to any man, but that for the loue of man he voluntarily ſubiected himſelfe to the Iudgment of Pilate, not therby giuing him any authority ouer him, but humbly permitting that which he had not of right, but of fact. And this he ſheweth elſwhere, (2) when being demanded Tribute, he proued that he was not bound to pay it, but yet that he might not ſcandalize them, he cauſed it to be paid. And thus S. Cyril (3) and S. Chriſoſtome do expound this place of S. Iohn, not of the power of Iuriſdiction, but of Gods Permiſſion.

(1) Io. 19. 11.

(2) Mat. 17. 27.

(3) *In hunc locum.*

Others vrge that of S. Paul, (4) *At Cæſars Iudgment-ſeat I ſtand, where I ought to be iudged &c. I appeale to Cæſar.* But if Paul acknowledge Cæſar his Iudge, then ought the Pope to do the lyke. Anſw. (5) Some affirme that Paul appealed to Cæſar, becauſe though not of right, yet of fact he was then Iudge. Others (6) thinke the difference to be great betweene Heathen and Chriſtian Princes; for no Biſhop is Iudge of the Heathen, but only of the faythfull, according to that of the ſame Apoſtle, (7) *What is it to me to iudge of them that are without?* And ſo euery Biſhop is ſubiect to his heathen Prince in all Ciuill cauſes, the law of Chriſt depriuing no man of his right and Dominion: & ſo (8) S. Peter, & S. Paul, do exhort the faithfull to be ſubiect to their Princes, who were then Heathen: and accordingly S. Paul appealed

(4) Act. 25. 10. 11.

(5) *Turrecrem. ſum. de Eccleſ. l. 2. c. 96.*

(6) *Pighius l. 5. Hier. Eccl. c. 7.*

(7) 1. Cor. 5. 12.

(8) 1. Pet. 2. Rom. 13. tit. 3.

pealed to Cæsar as his Iudge, being accused of raysing sedition amongst the People. Now, Christian Princes having voluntarily vndertaken the lawes of the Ghospell, do thereby subiect themselues to the supreme Pastour of the Ecclesiasticall Hierarchy, as sheep to the Pastour, and members to the head, and therefore cannot now iudge him, but be iudged by him.

(9) 3 Reg. 2. 27.

Others yet alledge, that in the old Law the King did Iudge and depose the high Priest, for so (9) Salomon deposed Abiathar, and substituted Sadoch: In like sort therefore in the new Law a Christian Prince may be Iudge and depose a Bishop. Answere. Salomon did not depose Abiathar, as a King, but as a Prophet, and the Executioner of Gods Iustice, doing this as the text sayth, *that the word of our Lord might be fulfilled.* Secondly, the similitude is not good, for seeing in the Old Testament, the promises were onely temporall, and in the New spirituall and eternall, as Saint Hierome (10) & S. Austine teach; it was no meruaile, if in the Old Testament the temporall power were greatest, & in the New, the spirituall. But yet the Truth is, that euen in the Old Testament, the high Priest was greater then the King, as might be proued from the (11) Scriptures, (12) and the Fathers.

(10) *L. 1. cont. Pelagianos. & Ep. ad Dardanum. Aug. q. 13. in librum Numer. & l. 19. cont. Faust. c. 31.*

(11) *Num. c. 27. 31. Leuit. 4. 1. 13. 23. 28.*

(12) *Philo l. de victimis. Theodoret. q. 1. in Leuit. Procopius in c. 4. Leuit.*

It is yet further obiected, that seeing it is lawfull for any man to kill the Pope, if he should vniustly inuade him to take away his lyfe; much more lawfull may it be for Kings or Councells to depose him, if he should trouble the Commonwealth, or by his bad example endeauour to ruine soules. Answ. The consequence is not good, no authority being required for the resisting an Inuader, and defending a mans selfe, whereas to iudge, or punish, authority is necessary: wherefore as it is lawfull to resist the Pope, inuading the Body, so also is it lawfull to resist him inuading the Soule, troubling the Commonwealth, or endeauoring to destroy the Church. I say it is lawfull to resist him, not doing what he commaundeth, or hindering the Execution of his will; but it is not lawfull to iudge him, punish him, or depose him, because these only belong to him that is Superiour.

CHAP.

CHAP. X.

The true State of the Queſtion, concerning Antichriſt.

Whether Antichriſt be yet come; And whether the Biſhop of Rome can be ſayd to be Antichriſt.

SECT. I.

Catholike Doctrine.

FORMER ages not dreaming of ſo ſenſeles a Paradoxe, as the Pope being Antichriſt, there is not therfore in any ancient Councels any thing to be found concerning the ſame. But the vniforme (1) conſent and doctrine of the Catholicke Church is, and euer hath bene, that Antichriſt is not yet come, that he is to come neere the ending of the world, that he is to be one man, and to worke ſtrange wonders, that his raigne is to be ſhort, and ſundry ſuch like, which cannot be aſcribed to any Pope that euer was.

(1) *Bellar. de ſum. Pontif. lib. 3. c. 1. & c. Rhem. Teſtam. Apoc. 13. & in 2. Theſſ. 2.*

Points not defyned.

Concerning the name of Antichriſt, S. Ireneus (2) thinketh it probable, that the name λατεινος may be applyed

(2) *L. 5.*

vnto it, but more probable, that it shalbe called *ουλαν*. Others (3) thinke, that he shalbe called *ἀρνουμαι*. Others, (4) that these figures 666. shall not signify his name, but the triple pronunciation of the Deuill to be fulfilled in Antichrist. Others (5) most truly acknowledge herin their ignorance, auouching that his name is not yet knowne. And most cleere it is, that the foresaid figures do agree with seuerall most distinct Names.

(3) *Primasius, Anselmus, Richardus in hunc locum Apoc.*
(4) *Rupertus in Apoc.*
(5) *Iren l. 5. Arethas in hunc locum Apoc.*

As touching Antichristes Character, some (6) affirme the leters wherewith his name is to be written to be the same. (7) Others, the contemning and abolishing of the Signe of the Crosse. (8) Others professe their ignorance thereof.

(6) *Primasius, Beda, Rupertus.*
(7) *Hippol. Orat. de consum. mundi.*
(8) *Bellar. de Rom. Pont. l. 3. c. 21.*

Some vnderstand by Gog and Magog, Heretickes. (10) Others by Gog the Diuell, and by Magog, Antichrists Armie. (11) Others, that the war of Gog & Magog shalbe the warre of Antichrist agaynst the Church. And that by Gog is signifyed Antichrist, and by Magog his Army.

(9) *Hier. in Ezech. c. 38.*
(10) *Aug. de Ciuit. l. 20. c. 11.*
(11) *Bellar. de Rom. Pont. l. 3. c. 17.*

Protestants vntruthes.

Rogers auoucheth that, (14) *The Pope doth performe no part of a Christian, but euery part of an Antichristian Bishop, in corrupting the doctrine of the truth with errours and cursed opinions, in polluting the Sacraments of Christ by superstitious Ceremonies, in persecuting the Church and Saintes, with fyre and sword, in making merchandise of Gods heritage, in sitting in the Temple of God as God, shewing himselfe that he is God, and exalting himselfe agaynst all that is called God, or that is worshipped.* And (15) *his Iurisdiction hath bene, and is iustly renounced and banished out of England by Kings and Parlaments, as by King Edward the 1. 3. and 6. by King Richard the second, by King Henry the 4. and 8. &c.* There is not one Point heere auouched by M. Rogers which is not a grosse lye; and in particular, that the Popes Iurisdiction was not banished out of England by Kings and Parlaments, as Rogers pretendeth, will easily appeare, by viewing onely F. Parsons Answere to S. Edward Cookes Reportes.

(14) *Def. of the Artic. art. 37. p. 210.*
(15) *Ib. Art. 37. p. 212.*

Caluin produceth seuerall reasons in proofe that the Pope

Pope is Antichriſt, as that, (16) *He boaſteth, that he can bynd Conſciences with what Law he pleaſeth, and make them ſubiect to Eternall punishments: He at his pleaſure either ordayneth new Sacraments, or corrupteth thoſe which are ordayned by Chriſt; yea altogether aboliſheth them, that in place of them he may ſubſtitute thoſe ſacrileges which himſelfe hath inuented. He deuiſeth meanes of gaining Saluation altogether different from the Doctrine of the Ghoſpell. To conclude, he ſticketh not at his pleaſure to change the whole Religion. What, I beſeech you, is it to extoll a mans ſelfe aboue all that is reputed God, if this the Pope doth not?* If abhominable lyes were ſtrong proofes, certainly theſe would demonſtrate & conclude the Pope to be Antichriſt.

(16) In 2. Theſſ. 2.

Proteſtant Doctrine.

Caluin (17) and other Prot. teach, that Antichriſt is already come, and that not one man, but the whole ſucceſſion of Popes for many ages, is the ſaid Antichriſt. A Point of ſuch importance, that the Prot. aſſembled at Vapingum Anno 1603. did make it an Article of their faith, that, (18) *they ſhould believe and defend the Biſhop of Rome to be properly Antichriſt, and the ſonne of Perdition, foretold in the Word of God.*

(17) *In Hit. l. 4 c. 7 ſ. 13. 24. 25.* Whitak. of Antichriſt. pa. 66.

(18) Article 42.

Whitaker (19) and ſundry other Prot. teach that, *Boniface the third* (who liued Anno 607.) *and all his Succeſſours to haue bene Antichriſts.* Rogers obiecting many Crimes againſt the B. of Rome ſaith, (20) *In reſpect of which fruites of impieties, the ſaid B. of Rome in the holy Scripture is deſcribed to be very Antichriſt, that wicked man, that man of ſinne, the ſonne of Perdition, and the Aduerſary of God.* But how abſurd this is, and directly contrary to Scriptures, Fathers, and many others more learned Prot. I ſhall preſently diſcouer.

(19) De Eccleſ. p. 144. Fulke in his Anſw. to a Counterf. Cath. p. 27. Downham of Antichriſt p. 4.

(20) Def. of the Art. art. 37. p. 111.

SECT. II.

It is proued by the Scriptures, that Antichriſt is not yet come; and that the Biſhop of Rome cannot be ſaid to be Antichriſt.

IN cleerer Confutation of this fooliſh Paradoxe of the Pope being Antichriſt, we muſt obſerue that the word *Antichriſt*, ſignifyeth one who oppoſeth himſelfe to Chriſt; for the Propoſition, ἀντὶ, doth properly ſignify oppoſition; now becauſe thoſe thinges are not only ſaid to be oppoſite, which impugne one another, but alſo thoſe which are equipollent, therfore ἀντὶ in compoſition, doth ſometimes ſignify Contrariety, and other tymes equiualence, but neuer ſubordination, which the word *Vicar* doth, when the Pope is titled the *Vicar of Chriſt*. Againe, in Scriptures he is called *Antichriſt* (1) *who is extolled aboue all that is called God*, and (2) *who denieth Ieſus to be Chriſt, and affirmeth himſelfe* (3) *to be Chriſt*, none of which is to be the Vicar, but the profeſſed Enemy of Chriſt. And in this ſenſe is vnderſtood the word, ἀντιχριστος, by Henricus (4) Stephanus the great Grecian of Geneua.

(1) 2. *Theſſ.* 2.
(2) 1. *Ioan.* 2.
(3) *Mat.* 24.
(4) In his Theſaurus.

But to come to the matter it ſelfe, Chriſt our Sauiour ſayth, (5) *I am come in the name of my Father, and you receiue me not, if another ſhall come in his owne Name, him you will receiue.* Here our Sauiour ſpeaking of *Antichriſt*, (as Fathers (6) generally vnderſtand) oppoſeth not a kingdome or ſucceſſion of men to himſelfe, but another perſon, whom S. Paul calleth (7) *The man of ſinne, the ſonne of Perdition*; whom Chriſt alſo foretelleth, that the Iewes will *receiue*, which yet they neuer did the Pope.

(5) *Ioan.* 5. 43.
(6) See hereafter. next. ſec. 3.
(7) 2. *Theſſ.* 2. 3.

S. Paul ſpeaking of Antichriſt giueth this good Counſaile, (8) *Let no man ſeduce you by any meanes, for vnles there come a Reuolt firſt, and the man of ſinne be reueyled, the ſonne of Perdition, which is an aduerſary, and is extolled aboue all that is called God, or that is worſhipped, ſo that he ſitteth in the Temple of God, ſhewing himſelfe as if he were God.* This is ſpoken of Antichriſt by our

(8) 2. *Theſſ.* 2. 3. 4.

Aduer-

Aduerſaries (9) Confeſſion, & yet almoſt euery word doth conuince them. For firſt it is ſaid, that there ſhall come a *Reuolt*, or falling away before Antichriſtes comming, which whether it be vnderſtood of the *Roman Empyre*, (as ſundry (10) Fathers, and the Prot. Piſcator (11) do thinke) or of *Fayth* and *Religion* (as ſome Prot. contrary to all Scriptures do imagine) is yet in neither ſenſe performed before that tyme in which Proteſtants place Antichriſtes firſt comming.

Secondly, theſe words, *The man of ſinne, the ſonne of Perdition, he ſitteth ſhewing himſelfe*, do ſignify one determinate perſon; and the rather in that the Greeke Article is prefiged, which doth determine (12) the ſignification to one certaine thing: which is yet more manifeſt by thoſe words of S. Iohn, (13) ἀκηκόατε ὅτι ὁ ἀντίχριστος ἔρχεται, καὶ νῦν ἀντίχριστοι πολλοὶ γεγόνασιν: where ſpeaking of *Antichriſt*, who is to be one man, the Article is ſet before, but ſpeaking of *Antichriſt* as it is taken for all ſuch as any wayes impugne Chriſt, the Article is omitted.

Thirdly *Antichriſt* muſt be not only an (14) *Aduerſary* to Chriſtian Profeſſion, but alſo (as (15) Zanchius vnderſtandeth the ſayd words) an open and profeſſed Aduerſary, ſuch an one, as ſhall (16) *deny the Father, and the Sonne, and extoll himſelfe aboue all that is called God; ſhewing himſelfe as though he were God*, not (17) *caring for any God*; And, (18) *will come in his owne Name*, cauſing thoſe to be (19) *ſlayne, that will not adore his Image*. None of all which, yet did any Pope.

Fourthly, *he is to ſit in the Temple of God*, whereby is vnderſtood the *Temple of Hieruſalem*, which Antichriſt will ſeeke to reedify. So S. Iohn telling that Enoch and Elias ſhalbe ſlaine by Antichriſt, affirmeth, that, (20) *The Beaſt ſhall kill them, and their Corpes ſhall lye in the ſtreetes of the great City (which ſpiritually is called Sodome, and Aegypt) where alſo their Lord was crucifyed.* Whereby is euidently vnderſtood Hieruſalem, there, and not at Rome, Chriſt being crucifyed: the ſame alſo being called Sodome by the Prophet Eſay in his viſion concerning (21) Iude and Hieruſalem, ſaying: (22) *Heare yee the word of our Lord, Princes of Sodome, giue eare to the*

(9) *Lambertus, Antichriſtus, &c. p. 75.*
(10) *Ambr. in 2 Theſſ. 2. Hier. q. 11. ad Algaſiam. Aug. de Ciu. Dei l. 20. c. 19. Cyr. Cateth. 15. Chryſoſt. in 2. Theſſ. 2.*
(11) *In Epiſtolas Pauli p. 468.*
(12) *Epiphan. har. quæ eſt Samaritanorum.*
(13) *1. Ep. 2. 18.*
(14) *ἀντικείμενος. 2. Theſſ. 2. 4.*
(15) *In Pauli Epiſtolas p. 243.*
(16) *Ep. Io. 2. 22.*
(17) *Dan. 11. 37.*
(18) *Io. 5. 43.*
(19) *Ap. 13. 15.*
(20) *Apoc. 11. 8.*
(21) *C. 1. 2.*
(22) *Ib. ver. 10.*

Law of our God, yet People of Gomorrha. Yea the word (*ſpiritually*) doth plainly argue, that thereby is meant one materiall and particular place, ſpiritually called, in regard of the wickednes, Sodome and Ægypt.

Fiftly, Antichriſtes Raigne muſt be but of ſhort continuance, namely, as Chriſt preached but three yeares and a halfe; ſo likewiſe to Antichriſt muſt be permitted no longer tyme for his preaching or teaching. This terme is mentioned by the Prophet (23) Daniel, and S. Iohn, to be *a tyme and tymes and halfe a tyme*: or as ſome Prot. tranſlate, (24) *A tyme, two tymes, and halfe a tyme*. For as (25) Lyra (a naturall borne Iew) S. Auſtine & S. Hierome do obſerue, the word *tymes*, without any other determinate number, ſignifyeth according to the Hebrew phraſe, *two yeares*, & the word, *tyme*, in the ſingular number, *one yeare*: which ſayd vnderſtanding of times for yeares, is made yet more euident by the ſame Prophet Daniel, who by the like phraſe of (26) *ſeuen tymes*, ſignifyeth (as Proteſtants (27) themſelues do vnderſtand him) the *ſeuen yeares* of Nabuchodonoſors changed Eſtate.

To this yet further adde, that the continuance of Antichriſtes Perſecution is elſwhere explayned in a preſcribed certaine tyme, not only of *fourty two* (28) *monethes*, but alſo of a (29) *thouſand, two hundred, ſixty dayes*: both which do literally amount to the foreſaid tyme of *three yeares, and a halfe*. Now, there was neuer any Pope which by any Prot. was imagined to be Antichriſt, that raigned preciſely three yeares and a halfe. Add alſo that the ſhortnes in generall of Antichriſts raigne, is in many places of Scripture taught, as where it is ſaid, (30) (his) *dayes for the Elect ſhalbe shortned*: that, *he* (31) *hath but a short tyme*: *He* (32) *muſt tarry a short tyme*: *He* (33) *muſt be looſed for a little ſeaſon*. And laſtly that Antichriſtes raigne (34) is to be but a little before the end of the world. By all which it doth euidently appeare, that Antichriſtes Raigne muſt be but of ſhort continuance, & therfore Prot. making the Pope Antichriſt, for theſe thouſand yeares laſt paſt, do therby impugne the cleereſt Scriptures.

Now, wheras ſundry (35) Prot. would euade by affirming,

(21) *Dan.* 7. 25. *Apoc.* 12. 14.
(14) *Dan.* 12. 7 in the Engl. Bible of Anno 1576.
(15) *In Dan. c.* 12. *Aug. de Civ. Dei, l.* 20. *c.* 23. *Hier. in Dan. c.* 7.
(16) *Dan.* 4. 20.
(17) See the Marg. Notes of the Engl. Bible of Anno 1576. in Dan. 4. 31. And ſee Fr. du Ion. in Reuel. 12. p. 151.
(28) *Apoc.* 11. 12. & 13. 5.
(29) *Apoc.* 12. 6. & 12. 3.
(30) *Mat.* 24. 22.
(31) *Apoc.* 12. 12.
(32) *Apoc.* 17. 10.
(33) *Apoc.* 20. 3.
(34) *Dan.* 7. 9. 10. 12. *Apoc.* 20. 3. 4. *Mat.* 24. 14. 2. *Theſſ.* 2. 8. 1. *Io.* 1. 18.
(35) *Chytreus*

ming, that in those foresaid numbers, *of a tyme, two tymes & halfe*, 42. *monthes, and* 1260. *dayes*, S. Iohn vseth a certaine number or tyme, for an vncertaine, not vnderstanding thereby indeed any definite certainty of tyme at all. This yet is insufficient, for though the numbers, 10. 100. 1000. should be vsed sometimes in the Scriptures for an vncertaine time, yet that course houldeth only in such like full and perfect numbers, whereas the other foresaid numbers now in example or question, being each of them compounded of a mixt variety or inequality of numbers, as one, two and a halfe; fourty and two, and 1260. are vnlike to the other full and equall numbers, of 10. 100. 1000. And therfore not subiect to the like vnderstanding. Neither could that variety of numbers be to any end, if only an vncertaine number be vnderstood. But this is so euident, that, Foxe (36) with sundry other Prot. do all of them vnderstand heerby a certayne definite tyme, answerable to the euent thereby fortould.

In the determining of which euent, Protestants do much vary amongst themselues; for (37) Danæus, *by a tyme, two tymes and halfe a tyme*, vnderstandeth *the* 350. *yeares, during which the Waldenses were persecuted.* And by (38) *the* 42. *monethes, &* 1260. *dayes*, he vnderstandeth three yeares and a halfe, in *which Husse and Hierome of Prague preached*. (39) Fox & Ford do by the 1260. *dayes* vnderstand the tyme of *Herods first persecution*: And by the 42. *Months*, (40) Fox after great study and doubtfulnes had thereof, vpon a suddayne receyueth, to vse his words (*arcano quodam admonitionis sibilo*) *by a certayne secret whispering admonition*, the sense therof to be, *a Sabboth of yeares, which*, sayth he, *amount to* 294. *yeares, wherein the Primitiue Church was persecuted before Constantines time.* By the 1260. *dayes, and the* 42. *monethes* Brocard (41) and Nappier do vnderstand the preuayling of the *Papacy for the last* 1260. *yeares*, since the tyme of Siluester and Constantine. So variable and vncertayne are Prot. in their determining the tyme of Antichristes coming and Raygne.

But supposing these different Interpretations were all of them true, as indeed not any one is, neither can any thing be

in Apoc. c. 11. *&* 13. *Bulling. in Apo. c.* 12. *Ser.* 40. *fol.* 142. *&* *ser.* 47. *fol.* 141. Deut. vpon the Reuel. p. 132.

(36) *In Ap. p.* 310. 365. *Dan. cont. Bel. part.* 1. *p.* 371. Nappier vp. the Reuel. pag. 145 161. Brocard vp. the Reuel. fol. 110. 133. Ford in Ap. p. 70. 71. 84. 87.

(37) *Cont. Bel. part.* 1. *p.* 372.

(38) *Ib. p.* 374.

(39) *In Apo. c.* 11. *p.* 304. 316. *Ford in Ap. 11. p.* 71. 84.

(40) *In Ap. c.* 13. *p.* 365. & Ford *in Ap. c.* 13. *p.* 97. *& in c.* 11. *p.* 70.

(41) Vpon the Reuel. f. 110. Nap. vp. the Reuel. p. 43. 68. 145. 161. 368. 233.

alledged in good proofe thereof, yet none of them do proue the Pope to be Antichrist: for first the (42) Waldenses, Husse and Hierome of Prague, were in the opinion of Prot. confessed Papists, and therefore in no danger to be persecuted by the Pope. But being truly heretickes, and holding sundry grosse errours, which Protestants disclayme, and for which they were most iustly punished, this strongly argueth the Pope to be a faythfull seruant of Christ, not Antichrist. Secondly Herods Persecution was before any Pope was. Thirdly the Persecution of the Primitiue Church, during the sayd supposed 294. yeares vntill Constantines tyme, was done not by the Pope, but by the then Heathen Emperours, who persecuted the then Popes of Rome.

(42) See the Prot. Apol. p 314. &c. 317. &c.

Fourthly the 1260. yeares of the Papacy preuayling since the tyme of Siluester and Constantine (the confessed antiquity of the Papacy being thereby deduced vp to the Ancient Fathers of those purer tymes) doth argue the Pope to be a true Bishop and Prophet, rather then Antichrist: as also the Church hauing bene grieuously persecuted before Constantine, if it hath also bene persecuted euer since till now, then the Predictions of the Prophets concerning the Churches florishing, quiet, and increase, were not as yet performed, which were wicked to thinke.

But at Antichrists coming, the persecution shalbe such, (43) *as was not since the beginning of the world, nor shalbe:* In so much as then *Sathan* (44) *shalbe loosed out of his Prison, and shall go forth and seduce the Nations that are vpon the foure corners of the Earth*: so that the persecution shalbe so much more grieuous then all former, by how much the (45) *Diuell* being loosed, and set at liberty, may tempt and tyrannize more then when he was bound: yea, as then the *Diuine Sacrifice* (46) shalbe taken away, which cleerly hitherto is vnaccõplished. And lastly the persecutions raysed by sundry Heathen Emperours, as Nero, Domitian, and Diocletian, did both for cruelty and number of persons persecuted, incomparably exceed all pretended cruelties of all Popes in all ages.

(43) *Mat.* 24. 25.
(44) *Apoc.* 20. 7.
(45) See hereof S. Aug. de Ciu. Dei. l. 20. c 8. 9.
(46) *Dan.* 12. 11. See *Iren. l.* 5. *Hier. & Theodoret. in hunc locum.*

The same also is confirmed by that of S. Iohn, (47) *The Angell*

(47) *Ap.* 10. 1. 2. *&c.*

Angell &c. apprehended the Old Serpent, which is the Diuell and Sathan, and bound him for a 1000. yeares &c. that he ſeduce no more the Nations, till the thouſand yeares be conſummate &c. And when the 1000. yeares ſhall be conſummate, Sathan ſhalbe looſed out of his priſon &c. and ſhall ſeduce the Nations &c. Heer though the nũber of a 1000. yeares be vncertayne, as ſignifying more yeares, yet to ſignify fewer yeares it cannot: a thing ſo euident, that ſome Prot. do (48) accordingly affirme the ſame, collecting thence that Antichriſts coming is to be (49) *after the firſt 1000. yeares from Chriſt.* To which purpoſe alſo Hoſpinian ſpeaking of the pretended corruption, which, as he affirmeth, preuayled at the end of the 1000. yeares after Chriſt, ſayth, (50) *Now began to draw neare the end of the Period of 1000. yeares, whereof Iohn in his Apocalips c. 20. writeth, then Sathan is to be looſed agayne.* Willet affirmeth that Wicliffe taught the ſayd 1000. yeares to end (51) *Anno Domini* 1600. *And that then Antichriſt ſhould beginne to appeare.* (52) Fox and (53) Walter Bruth thinke the ſayd 1000. yeares to end 1300. Hence it now appeareth that moſt Prot. placing Antichriſts coming within the firſt 1000. yeares next after this Reuelation (during which tyme at the leaſt Sathan was bound not to ſeduce the Church) do thereby impugne the ſacred Scriptures, and their owne other writers.

(48) Fr. du Ion. vp the Reuel. in c. 12. p. 153.
(49) *Ib. in* c. 20. *Reuel. p.* 857.
(50) *Hiſt. Sacram. l. 4. c. 2. p.* 295. and ſee Ep. Dedic.
(51) *Synop p.* 63.
(52) *In Apoc. c. 11. p.* 245. *& in c. 12. p.* 346.
(53) In Wil. Synopſ. p. 63.

Before this perſecution to be rayſed by Antichriſt, (54) *The Ghoſpell ſhalbe preached in all the world, for a Teſtimony to all Nations*; ſo as no Nation may excuſe its Infidelity. But this ſo generall preaching hath not yet been performed, as is euident in ſeuerall Kingdomes of the Eaſt and Weſt Indies lately found out, wherein no memory at all of Chriſt, or his Ghoſpell was found; neyther will it ſuffice to anſwere, that here it is not ſpoken of all the world abſolutly, but only by a figure, the whole is taken for a part; for otherwiſe S. Paul ſhould haue ſayd vntruly (55) *Into all the Earth hath the ſound of them gone forth, and vnto the ends of the whole world the wordes of them.* And (56) elſwhere ſpeaking of the Ghoſpell he ſayth, *In the whole world it is, and fructifyeth and groweth*: And (57) *is preached among all Creatures, that are vnder heauen.* But Chriſt maketh this preaching in all the world, to be a ſigne of the

(54) *Mat.* 24. 14.
(55) *Rom.* 10. 18.
(56) *Col.* 1. 6.
(57) *Col.* 1. 23.

end thereof, for so he immediatly addeth, *and then shall come the consummation*; wherefore if this preaching were not taken to be properly in all the world, but only in some parts thereof, then it were no signe, for in that sense, in the first twenty yeares after Christ, the Ghospell was preached by the Apostles in all the world: neyther in that sense could it be a Testimony to all Nations at the day of Iudgement. Besides, it was promised properly to Christ, that (58) *All Nations shall serue him*, and he dyed generally for all, and therefore in the (39) Apocalips, the Elect are described out of all Nations, and peoples, & Tribes: and in the same sense are these words vnderstood by S. Austine (60) S. Hierome and Origen.

(58) Ps. 71.
(59) Cap 7.
(60) Aug. Ep. 80. ad Hesych. Hier. & Orig. in Matth. c. 24.

Now, to the place obiected from the Romans, S. Aust. (61) answereth, that S. Paul tooke the preterperfect tense for the future, as Dauid also did, whose words they were: And that in the other place, S. Paul affirmed the Gospell, to be in all the world, not actually, but virtually, because the seed of Gods word was cast by the Apostles into the world, which fructifiing & increasing, might fil the whole world, as one putting fire to seuerall parts of a Citty, may truly be sayd to haue burned the whole Citty, because he placed the fyre, which by litle and litle increasing, consumed the whole Citty. It may also be answered with S. Hierome (61) and S. Thomas, that the fame of the Ghospell came to all Nations then knowne in the tyme of the Apostles, and that heereof only speaketh S. Paul.

(61) Ep. 80.
(61) In Matth. c. 10. D. Thom. in Rom. c. 10.

Enoch and Elias are reserued alive, that they may oppose themselues to Antichrist at his coming, and preserue the Elect in the faith of Christ, and at length conuert the Iewes; To which purpose it is said, *Behould* (63) *I will send you Elias the Prophet, before the coming of the great and fearfull day of our Lord* &c. *Elias* (64) *indeed shall come, and restore all things.* (65) And, *I will giue to my two witnesses, and they shall prophesy* 1260. *dayes*. Some answere that the words of Malachy are to be vnderstood of S. Iohn Baptist, of whom Christ said, (66) *he is Elias that is for to come*. But the truth is, that though S. Iohn Baptist, in regard of his office of being Precursor be-

(63) Mal. c. 4. 5. 6.
(64) Mat. 17. 11.
(65) Ap. 11. 3.
(66) Mat. 11. 14.

fore

fore the firſt coming of our Sauiour, as alſo in regard of his preaching vnto the people, was called Elias, in that Elias is to be the Preeurſor before the ſecond coming of Chriſt, & is to preach and conuert the Iewes; yet that the former wordes are to be vnderſtood of the true Elias it is playne, in that the Prophet ſpeaketh of the ſecond coming of Chriſt, when he ſhall come to Iudgment, to wit, at the *great and fearfull day:* whereas the firſt coming, when S. Iohn Baptiſt came, was not to iudge, but to be iudged, not to deſtroy, but to ſaue. Beſides S. Luke explaineth the ſame ſaying, (67) *And he ſhall go before him in the ſpirit and vertue of Elias;* and our Sauiour himſelfe, euen after S. Iohns death, auouched that, (68) *Elias ſhould come and reſtore all things.*

(67) Luc. 1. 17.

(68) Mat. 17. 11.

Some alſo reply, that by the two witneſſes are vnderſtood all the faithfull Miniſters, which God rayſeth vp in the tyme of Antichriſt, as Luther, Swinglius, Caluin &c. But this is idle, for of the two witneſſes S. Iohn ſayth, (69) *They ſhall propheſy 1260. dayes, cloathed with ſackcloathes, they ſhall haue power to turne waters into bloud, and to ſtrike the Earth with all plague. Antichriſt ſhall kill them, and their bodies ſhall lye in the ſtreetes in the great Citty &c. where their Lord alſo was crucified.* And, *after three dayes and a halfe, the ſpirit of lyfe from God ſhall enter into them.* And, *they ſhall go vp to heauen in a Cloud, & their Enemies ſee them:* Now that all, or any of theſe particulars were performed in Luther, or any other Prot. Miniſter, I thinke no man will auouch.

(69) Ap. 11. 3, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12.

At Antichriſts, coming his name and Character ſhalbe ſo knowne, as that, (70) *He ſhall make all litle and great, & rich and poore &c. to haue a Caracter in their right hand, or in their foreheades.* And, *that no man may buy or ſell, but he that hath the Character, or the name of the Beaſt, or the number of his name.* Now what this name or Character is, hitherto is vnknowne.

(70) Ap. 13. 16, 17.

Antichriſt, at his Coming will worke many ſtrange ſignes and feigned miracles, his (71) *Coming is according to the operation of Sathan in all power, and lying ſignes and wonders.* And both he and his Miniſters (73) *ſhall ſhew great ſignes and wonders:* Yea he ſhall ſeeme to make *fyre* (73) *to come downe from heauen:* and to *make* (74) *the Image of the Beaſt to ſpeake.* In ſo

(71) 2. Theſſ. 2. 9.

(72) Mat. 24. 24.

(73) Ap. 13. 13.

(74) Ap. 13. 15.

much that (75) *All the Earth wilbe in admiration of him.* Now neuer did any Pope worke ſuch wonders as theſe. But the greateſt wonder to me is, that ſo many men endowed with comon ſenſe and reaſon as Prot. are, and profeſſing to belieue the ſacred Scriptures for moſt true, ſhould ſo directly contrary to all ſenſe and reaſon, and to ſo many cleereſt textes of ſacred Writ, maintayne a Paradoxe ſo groſſe and abſurd.

75) *Ap.* 13.

SECT. III.

That the Fathers expound the Scriptures agreably with Catholikes, in proofe that the Pope cannot be Antichriſt.

(1) *Ep. ad Algaſiam. q. 11. Damaſc. de fide. l. 4. c. 24.*

(2) *Cent. 5 c. 4. Col. 416.*

(3) *Tract. 29. in Ioan.*

(4) *Hom. 15. in Io. 5. & Orat. 4. in 2. Theſſ. 2. Cyr. Alex. l. 3. in Io. c. 6. Ambroſ. in 2. Theſſ. 2. Ruffinus in Expoſ. Symb. Iren. l. 5. cont. hær. c. 25.*

S. Hierome (1) and S. Damaſcene, do interprete the word ἀντίχριστος, to be one who doth emulate and oppoſe himſelfe to Chriſt. The Centuriſtes confeſſe that, (2) *S. Auſtine teacheth the Etymology of Antichriſt, in Epiſt. Ioannis, Tract. 3. He is called Antichriſt in Latin, who is contrary to Chriſt &c. Some vnderſtand Antichriſt to be ſo called, becauſe he is to come before Chriſt &c. It is not ſo ſaid, it is not ſo written, but Antichriſt, that is contrary to Chriſt &c. Likewiſe in Tract. de Antichriſto, deſiring to know of Antichriſt, firſt you ſhall marke why he is ſo called, to wit, for that he wilbe contrary to Chriſt in all thinges &c. he will diſſolue the Euangelicall law, and will recall into the world the worſhiping of Deuils.*

S. Auſtine (3) himſelfe expounding thoſe wordes of S. Iohn, (4) *He that ſpeaketh of himſelfe, ſeeketh his owne glory,* affirmeth that, *This ſhalbe he who is called Antichriſt, extolling himſelfe, as the Apoſtle ſayth, aboue all that is called God, and which is worshiped: for our Lord declaring that he will ſeeke his owne glory, not the glory of the Father, ſayth to the Iewes: I came in the name of my Father, and you receiued me not, another ſhall come in his owne name, him you will receiue; he shewed, that they would receiue Antichriſt, who would ſeeke the glory of his owne name.* And the ſame expoſition of this place is giuen by S. Chryſoſtome, S. Cy-

S. Cyril. S. Ambroſe, S. Irenæus, and Ruffinus.

Concerning the tyme of Antichriſtes raigne, S. Irenæus (5) alleadging thoſe wordes of Daniel, *A tyme, tymes, & halfe a tyme, that is* (ſaith he) *three yeares and ſixe monthes, in which Antichriſt cõming, ſhall raigne vpon the Earth.* Hipolitus (6) writing vpon thoſe wordes of Daniel, (7) *He will confirme the Couenant to many one weeke, and in the halfe of the weeke ſhall the hoaſt and the ſacrifice faile,* ſayth: *When Daniel ſaid, he will confirme his Couenant to many one weeke, is ſignifyed ſeauen yeares. The Prophets ſhall preach halfe a weeke &c. that is three yeares and a halfe Antichriſt ſhall raigne vpon Earth, after his kingdome and glory ſhalbe taken away.* S. Chryſoſtome affirmeth, that, (8) *Many Scriptures do ſignify, and eſpecially S. Iohn in his Reuelation, that Antichriſts kingdome is to continue three yeares and ſixe moneths.* Saint Hierome writing vpon the 11. Chapter of Daniel, teacheth that, *Ours do better and more truly expound, that in the end of the world Antichriſt is to do theſe thinges, who is to ryſe from the Iewes &c. and is to perſecute the Saintes three yeares and a halfe, that is, 1260. dayes, and after to periſh vpon the famous and holy mountayne.* And alſo, (9) *Tyme ſignifieth a yeare, Tymes, according to the propriety of the Hebrew ſpeach, who alſo haue the Duall number, prefigure two yeares, and halfe a tyme ſixe monthes, in which the Saintes are permitted to the power of Antichriſt.* S. Cyril: *Antichriſt ſhall raigne only three yeares and a halfe, which we affirme not from Apocriphall Bookes, but from the Prophet Daniel* S. Auſtine is ſo full herein, that he doubteth not to write, that, (11) *he who being halfe aſleepe, readeth theſe thinges, may not doubt of the moſt cruel raigne of Antichriſt againſt the Church, although it is to be indured but a ſhort tyme. For tyme, and times, and halfe a tyme, are one yeare, and two yeares, and a halfe. And by this it is manifeſt to be three yeares and a halfe; the number alſo of the dayes being afterwards ſet down: ſometymes in the Scriptures it is declared by the number of moneths.*

S. Auſtine likewiſe affirmeth that he ſhall ſpring from the Iewes, ſaying, (12) *As our Authors ſay, Antichriſt ſhalbe borne of the people of the Iewes, of the Tribe of Dan, according to the Prophet, ſaying, (13) Be Dan a ſnake in the way, a ſerpent in the path.* This Prophecy is vnderſtood of Antichriſt, by (14) Irenæus, Hippo-

(5) *L. 5. cont. hær. c. 25.*
(6) *De Conſum. mundi. & Antich.*
(7) C. 9 27.
(8) *Ho. 49. ex c. 24. Math. operis imperf.*
(9) *In Cap. 7. Dan.*
(10) *Cateth. 15.*
(11) *L. 20. de Ciu. Dei. c. 23.* And according to the Engl. Tranſlation p. 823.
(12) *Tract. de Antichr. & de Benedict. Iacob.* and ſee *Cant. 5. c. 4. Col. 416.*
(13) *Gen. 49. 17.*
(14) *Irem. l. 5. adu. hær. Hip. Orat. de Conſum. ſæc. Ambr. c. 7. de bened. Patriar. Aug. q. 12. in Ioſue. Proſ. l. de prædict. q. 4. Theod. q. 1. in Gen. Greg. l. 20. Mor. c. 13.*

Hippolitus, Ambroſe, Auſtine, Proſper, Theodoret, Gregory, and many others vpon the 7. Chapter of the Apocalyps, where they ſuppoſe that S. Iohn did omit *Dan*, from amongſt the Elect of the Iſraeliticall Tribes, in deteſtation of Antichriſt to be borne of that Tribe. And certaine it is, that the Iewes will receiue and follow him for their Meſſias, as our Sauiour himſelfe ſayth, (15) *If another ſhall come in his owne name, him you will receiue*; which maketh it very probable, that he ſhalbe a Iew borne, elſe they would not ſo eaſily admit him.

(15) Io. 5. 43.

The Fathers alſo teach, that Antichriſt ſhall ſit in the Temple of Hieruſalem, and not in the Church of Rome. S. Cyril demaundeth, (16) *What Temple ſaith the Apoſtle? In the Temple of the Iewes which is left: for God forbid that it ſhould be in this, in which we are.* S. Hilary affirmeth that, (17) *Antichriſt is therfore called by Daniel, Abhomination, becauſe comming againſt God, he challengeth Gods honour to himſelfe &c.* And, *receiued by the Iewes, ſhall ſit in the place of Sanctification, that where God was inuocated by the prayers of Saintes, there he receiued by Infidels, ſhould be worſhiped with Gods honour.* S. Gregory Nazianzen writeth: (18) *Aſconcerning this place, The Abhomination of deſolation ſtanding in the holy Place, they ſay, that the Temple of Hieruſalem is to be built againe, and Antichriſt is to be beleiued to be Chriſt, by the Iewes; and that he is to ſit therin, and is to be thought to be the king of the whole world: But he ſhall come at the Deſolation and ruine of the world.* Arethas writing vpon the foreſaid wordes of the Apocalyps, auoucheth that, (19) *He ſhall caſt their bodies vnburyed into the ſtreetes of Hieruſalem: for there ſhall he raigne as king of the Iewes.* And the like is taught by S. Irenæus (20) and Hypolitus.

(16) Catech. 15.
(17) Can. 15. in Math.
(18) Orat. 47.
(19) In Apoc. 11.
(20) L. 5. c. 30. Hipol. l. de Conſum. mundi.

Concerning Enoch and Elias their Coming to reſiſt Antichriſt, S. Ambroſe writing vpon theſe wordes of S. Paul, (21) *I thinke that God hath ſhewed vs Apoſtles the laſt, as it were deputed to death*, expoundeth them thus: (22) *This therfore doth he apply to his perſon, becauſe he was alwayes in need, ſuffering perſecutions and preſſures aboue the reſt, euen as Enoch & Elias are to ſuffer, who are to be Apoſtles in the laſt tyme, for they are to be ſent before Chriſt to prepare the people of God ſound to ſtrengthen all Churches*

(21) 1. Cor. 4. 9.
(22) In 1. Cor. 4.

Churches for the reſiſting of Antichriſt, who, the Apocalyps doth teſtify, muſt both ſuffer Perſecution, and be ſlayne. And the like is taught moſt plainly by (23) S. Auſtine, ſaying, *That Elias ſhall conuert the Iewes to Chriſt, vltimo tempore, before the end of the world &c. is moſt commonly beleeued and taught of vs Chriſtians, and is held as a point of Infallible truth, for we may well hope of the comming of him before the Iudgment of Chriſt, whom we do truly beleeue to liue in body at this houre, without euer hauing taſted of Death.*

(23) *De Ciu. Dei l. 20. c. 29.*

But the Ancient Fathers were ſo wholy Romane Catholike in this Point, as that Fulke confeſſeth, ſaying, (24) *Indeed moſt of the Ancient Fathers did Iudge that the Romane Empire ſhould firſt be decayed, before Antichriſt were reuealed.* Whereof alſo ſayth Caluin, (25) *For as much as they haue expounded this place, of the defection of the Romane Empire, it is more friuolous then that it needeth any long Confutation: and I do meruayle that ſo many writers, otherwiſe learned and witty, haue bene deceyued in ſo eaſy a thing, but that when one had erred, the reſt without Iudgement followed the traine.* Of this alſo write the Centuriſts, (26) *Auſtine in his Treatiſe of Antichriſt, declareth in few words the tyme of Antichriſtes comming, therefore the Apoſtle Paul from hence affirmeth, Antichriſt not to come before into the world, vnleſs firſt a departure ſhall come, that is, vnleſſe all Kingdomes ſhall depart from the Romane Empyre, which were before ſubiect vnto it.* So many ſeuerall wayes do the Ancient Fathers teſtify from the Scriptures, that the Pope is not Antichriſt.

(24) *Ag. Rhem. Teſt. in 2. Theſſ. 2. 3.*

(25) *In Theſſ. 2. 3.*

(26) *Cent. 5. c. 4. Col. 410.*

SECT. IIII.

That Prot. agree with Catholikes in the Doctrine of the Pope not being Antichriſt.

THough nothing be more frequently declaimed in Prot. Pulpits, thē the Pope being Antichriſt; yet how much that foolery is diſclaymed by the learneddſt Prot. Writers, this preſent Section ſhall teſtify. M. Foxe writing vpon the 11. Chapter of the Apocalyps, where S. Iohn mentioneth

neth Antichrists Raigne to be (42) *moneths*, acknowledgeth that, (1) *It cannot be that a long tyme should be figured by the same short tyme, for by a short tyme, a short tyme is signifyed*; to which end he also alledgeth the testimonies of Lambertus & Chytræus. Wherefore it cannot be imagined, that the Popes of Rome for so many hundred yeares to haue bene Antichrists.

Bucer is of opinion that *Mahomet* (2) *is that very Antichrist, who for many ages hath subiected most Nations of the* (believing) *Gentiles vnto the bondage of Sathan.* Fox affirmeth that, (3) *Although, as S. Iohn sayth, there be many Antichrists, which are forerunners, yet to speake of the head and principall Antichrist he is to come in the later end of the world, whereby is meant no doubt the Turke.* And he maketh the like exposition of (4) *Sathan being loosed* at the end of the 1000. yeares, which he vnderstandeth to be directly meant of the *Turke*, and but Anagogically of the Pope. Peter Martyr determineth as well (5) *Mahomet*, as the Pope to be Antichrist.

Zanchius (6) hauing recyted the opinion both of the Papists and Prot. concludeth, that (7) *It may not be denyed, but that neere the end of the world, a certaine man shall aryse in the Church of Christ, who shall exceed all the other Antichristes in malice, power, and other wickednes: And of this man may be vnderstood the Prophecy of Iohn and Daniel, of 3. yeares and a halfe, in which he shall raigne.*

Lambertus in his Treatise much commended by Fox, (8) affirmeth that (9) *Antichrist is not yet come*: and that the foresaid place (10) *to the Thessalonians, is to be vnderstood of an open professed Enemy*; as also that (11) *the Pope although he doth* (in his opinion) *corrupt with his lyes, the true sense of the Mysteries of faith; yet for so much, as he doth not openly forbid to beleeue them, he therfore is not that great Antichrist.* For which beliefe D. Doue reproueth some of his owne Brethren, saying, (12) *Some learned Prot. being ouer much modest, make a doubt whether Antichrist be yet reueyled or not.*

Add hereunto that such Prot. as do absolutely affirme the Pope to be Antichrist, do yet mainly differ in the assigning of the Man, or the tyme of his comming: for first, Fulke, (13) Whitaker, and others do giue instance of Boniface

(1) In *Ap. c. 11. p. 239. & in c. 12. p. 347. 347.* And Fr. du Ion. vp the Reuel. in c. 20. p. 257. 258.
(2) *Liber Psalmorum, 5. in Ps. 22. fo. 146. 147.*
(3) *Act. & Mon. p. 730.*
(4) *Ib. p. 743.*
(5) *Com. plac. pa. 351.*
(6) *In Ep. Pauli ad Phil. Col. &c. p. 245.*
(7) *Ib. p. 246.*
(8) *In Apoc. c. 11. p. 239.*
(9) See *Antichristus siue progn. finis mundi p. 74.*
(10) *Ib p. 75.*
(11) Ib. p. 79.
(12) Serm. of the second Comming of Christ & the disclosing of Antichrist versus fin.
(13) Answer. to a Counterf. Cath.

face the third Anno 607. Nappier collecteth the yeare of his comming, to be about (14) Anno 313. and that Pope (15) Siluester was the man. Bullingers Iudgment is, that Antichriſt ſhould appeare (16) that fatall yeare of our Lord 763. And another Prot. wryter (17) aſſigneth yet a longer time, and nameth Hildebrand (who was Gregory the ſeauenth) and who liued (18) 1074. Fox (19) thinketh his comming to be Anno 300. So variable is the Collection which Prot. make from Scriptures, concerning the perſon, and tyme of Antichriſt: Wheras no doubt, at his comming, he will be eaſily knowne by reaſon of the great wonders he ſhall worke, the ſtrange perſecutions he ſhall rayſe, and ſundry ſuch like, ſo plainly foretould vs by the Scriptures themſelues. And yet this their confeſſed incertainty notwithſtanding, Fox termeth this point, (20) *the head, and body of all Controuerſies.* But the Premiſes conſidered, I thinke I may more truly terme it a mere fiction, begunne vpon ſplene or choller, and deſperatly continued without Scripture, or reaſon.

p.18. Whitak. of Antich. p.66. Willet Synop. p. 160. Perkins vp. the Creed. p. 307.
(14) Vp. the Reuel. p.66. 68.
(15) *ib.* p. 48.
(16) *In Apo. in c. 13. ſer. 61. fol. 198.*
(17) Fr. du Ion. vp. the Reuel. in c. 20. p 157.
(18) Cowpers Chron. f. 197. 199.
(19) *In Apo. p. 98. 245. 346. 347.*
(20) *In Apo. c 11. p. 318.*

SECT. V.

Obiections from Scriptures that the Pope is Antichriſt, anſwered.

SVndry (1) Prot. do vrge for their thiefeſt obiection, that by the (2) *7. hilles vpon which the woman ſitteth*, is deſcribed the Citty of Rome, and conſequently Rome is Antichriſts ſeate. But I anſwere firſt, In the ſame verſe, *thoſe 7. hilles, are ſaid to be 7. Kings.* Secondly, (3) S. Auſtine and others do vnderſtand by the *Where*, the vniuerſall Citty of the Diuel, which in the Scriptures is often called *Babylon*, and is oppoſed to the Citty of God, which is his Church: and by *7. mountaines* they vnderſtand the whole cõpany of the Proud, and eſpecially the Kings of the Earth. Thirdly, though thereby be vnderſtood *Rome*, (as ſome rather (4) thinke) yet ſeeing the *where* is the ſayd to be in being, for fiue of the Kings mentioned, (5) *vpon which the woman ſate*, are ſayd to be then

(1) Fulk. ag. Rhem. Teſt. in Ap. 17. ſec. 7. Nap. vpõ the Reuel. in c. 17. p. 205. Willet. Synop. p. 171.
(2) *Ap. 17. 9.*
(3) *In Pſ. 86. Aretbas, Beda, Rupertus, in Ap. c. 17.*
(4) *Apoc. 17. 15. 18. ſee*

Tertul. l. cont. Iud. & l. 3. cont. Marcion. Hieron. Ep. 17. ad Marcellam, & q. 11. ad Algasiam.

fallen, and that the sixt *then*(6) *was*, whereby it is manifest that the *woman* her selfe was then also in being, it cannot be vnderstood of the Church of Rome, whose (7) *fayth was then renowned in the whole world*, but of the heathen Citty (8) *which hath Kingdome ouer the Kings of the Earth, and which was* (9) *drunken of the bloud of the Saints, and of the bloud of the Martyrs of Iesus.* In which manner was the Citty of Rome, during the extremest Persecutions of Nero, Domitian, and other Roman Emperours.

(5) *Vers* 10.
(6) *Vers.* 10.
(7) *Rom.* 1.8. & 16. 19.
(8) *Apoc.* 17. 18.
(9) *Vers.* 6.

But some reply that Antichrist is to sit(10) *in the Temple of God*, and therefore in the true Church; and whereas we answere, that by the *Temple of God*, is vnderstood the *Temple of Hierusalem*, they vrge that,(11) that long since was destroied and shall neuer agayne be reedifyed. But that thereby is truly meant the *Temple of Hierusalem*, is plaine, as is (12) before proued; as also in that in the Scriptures of the New Testament, by the *Temple of God*, are neuer vnderstood the Churches of Christians, but alwayes the *Temple of Hierusalem*: yea the Ancient fathers both Greeke and Latine, for diuers ages did forbeare to call the Churches, *Temples*, but eyther Oratories, *or howses of prayer*, or the like. And this they did eyther in regard, that as then they had no *Temples*, but places in priuate houses appointed for prayer, or else that thereby they might distinguish the Church from the Synagogue; the memory of the Iewish Temple, being as then fully abolished: for which reason lykewise the Apostles in their writings, called not Christian *Priests*, *Priests*, but eyther *Bishops*, or *Seniors*.

(10) 2. *Thess.* 2. 4.
(11) *Dan.* 9. 27.
(12) See before, and see Apoc. 11. 18.

Further, the Iewes who are to receyue Antichrist for their Messias and King, will receyue none that sitteth not in Hierusalem, they dreaming nothing more, then of restoring Hierusalem and the Temple: yea at Antichrists coming Rome (if thereby be vnderstood the(13) *harlot*) shalbe made desolate, and burnt with fyre, so that it cannot be now sayd to be the Seat of Antichrist. Lastly, if Antichrist be to sit in the true Church, and to be accompted the head and Prince thereof, as Prot. (14) teach, and withall, if the Pope of Rome be Antichrist, as they further auoch, then it euident-

(13) *Apoc.* 17. 16.

ly

ly followeth, that the Pope ſitteth in the true Church, and is the head thereof. Now there is but one true Church, and there is but one Chriſt, which thing alſo (15) Caluin confeſſeth, therefore Prot. and all others who are not in the Church which is vnder the Pope, are out of the true Church of Chriſt.

Caluin foreſeeing this great inconuenience to follow, anſwereth, (16) *That as oftentymes buildings are ſo pulled downe, that the foundations and ruines remayne; ſo Chriſt hath not ſuffered his Church eyther to be ouerthrowne by Antichriſt from the foundation, or to be layd euen with the ground &c. but euen after the very waſting, he willeth that the building halfe pulled downe, ſhold yet remayne.* But this maketh againſt Caluin, for firſt, if the ruines of the Church of Chriſt only remaine, then the Church is ruinous, and conſequently the gates of hell haue preuayled againſt it, contrary to our Sauiours promiſe. (17) Secondly, if the Church hath ſuffered ruine, and the ruines and foundation, yea the building halfe pulled downe, be poſſeſſed by the Pope, then Prot. haue no Church, for the Church entyre and perfect, according to them is fallen to ruine, and the ruines are vnder Antichriſt. What then haue they? Peraduenture ſome new building; but in that it is new, it is not the houſe of Chriſt: Who then (not beſotted) doth not plainly ſee that it is far more ſafe to remaine in a Church, (though ruinous and halfe fallen) then in no Church? And who would thinke (conſidering the premiſes, and much more which may be gathered from the Fathers and otherwiſe) that men indued with common ſenſe and reaſon, would endeauour to defend a fancy ſo idle, as this conceipt of the Pope being Antichriſt?

(14) *Melanc. in Apol. Conf. Aug. art. 6 Cal. Inſtit. l. 4. c. 2. §. 12, & c. 7. §. 25. Illyr. Cent. 1. f. 21 c. 4. Col. 435.* and many others.

(15) *Calu. Inſtit. l. 4. c. 2. §. 2.*

(16) *Inſtit. l. 4. c. 2. §. 11.*

(17) *Math. 16. 18.*

CHAP. XI.

The true State of the Queſtion, concerning Euangelicall Counſailes, and the State of Perfection.

Whether there be Euangelicall Counſailes, or workes of ſupererogation, which if they be obſerued or done, are good and commendable, if omitted, not ſinnefull: or whether all things that are good, be commanded by God, and the omiſsion of them be ſinnefull.

SECT. I.

Catholike Doctrine.

ALTHOVGH men Senſuall, as ordinarily all Sectaries are, cannot endure to heare of the State of Perfection, or any thing that may tend to the contempt of the word & the mortification of the fleſh, yet the ſame hath euer beene approued, taught and practiſed, by the Catholike Church. So in the Councell of Baſill we are taught, that, (1) *Counſaile is a perſuaſion of a greater good, to which Chriſtians are not bound vnles they will, but Commandement is obligation of a neceſſary good, to which all are bound, although they would not.* In proofe heerof is alſo heer eyted the fourth Carthage

(1) *Oratio Henrici Kalteiſan de libera Prædicatione verbi Dei.*

thage Councell to ſay, *Counſayles are of our Lord, not commanding but exhorting.* And ſo (2) all Catholikes believe, that there are ſundry workes which are not inioyned by Chriſt by any Precept, but only counſailed as matter of Perfection: & theſe if they be done in the ſtate of Grace are commendable and meritorious; if omitted, not ſinnefull.

(1) *Bellar. de Monachis l. 1. c. 8. 9. & Rhem. Teſt. p. 33.*

Proteſtants Vntruthes.

Luther affirmeth that, (3) *Moyſes commanded Marriage to all the Iewes, ſo that it was not lawfull for any in the old Teſtament, to want a wyfe.* But how then did Elias, Elizeus, Hieremy, & S. Iohn Baptiſt, who had no wyues, as S. Hierome (4) proueth. Caluin (5) auoucheth that Monaſticall life was no where aproued by our Sauiour, not ſo much as by one ſyllable. But this lye is confuted by (6) S. Auſtine and (7) S. Chriſoſtome. (8) He likewiſe auerreth, that none of the Ancient Fathers thought that Chriſt counſayled any thing, but that euery word he ſpake was of neceſſity to be obeyed. But this will appeare moſt falſe in the 3. Section following. Rogers auoucheth Catholickes to ſay, that, *Supererogatory workes,* (9) *are tokens of forgiuenes of ſinnes, ſo well as Baptiſme; yea deliuer from the wrath of God, ſo well as Chriſt.* But it lying were a worke of ſupererogation and perfection, I would hould Rogers and his Brethren, to be men of the greateſt perfection this world hath knowne.

(3) *In Epithalamio.*
(4) *L. 1. cont. Iouin.*
(5) *Inſtit. l. 4. c. 12. §. 12.*
(6) *Ep. 89. q 4.*
(7) *Hom. 17. ad popul.*
(8) *Inſtit. l. 4. c. 12. §. 12.*
(9) *Def. of the Articl. art. 14. p. 82.*

Proteſtant Doctrine.

The Engliſh Prot. Church decreeth that, (10) *Voluntary workes beſides, ouer, and aboue Gods Commandements, which they call workes of ſupererogation, cannot be taught without arrogancy and impiety, for by them men do declare, that they do not only render vnto God as much as they are bound to do, but that they do more for his ſake, then of bounden duty is required* &c.

(10) Article 14.

Caluin auoucheth that, (11) *There is no litle word vttered by Chriſt, which we are not neceſſarily to obey.* Beza much diſliking Counſailes confeſſeth thus of himſelfe, (12) *I willingly auoyd*

(11) *Inſtit. l. 4. c. 13. §. 18.*
(12) *In 1. Cor. 7. 25.*

auoyd that false difference, betweene Precept, and Counsaile. And Melancthon thinketh, that (13) The Ghospell neither counsaileth nor commandeth to depart from riches, if they be not taken away, neither doth it counsaile nor command to giue thinges in common. So that according to Prot. whatsoeuer we do, or can do, that is good, we are bound of necessity vnder precept, and sinne to do it.

(13) In loc. tit. de pœnit.

Protestants agree with Ancient Heretickes.

S. Hierome (14) and S. Austine condemne Eunomius for affirming Virginity to be of no greater merit then Wedlock: and that leauing Monachisme he seduced Virgines to marry. And for the impugning of Virginity, Vigilantius and Heluidius are condemned by S. Hierome, (15) Iouinian & Faustus (16) by S. Austine, and Ebion by (17) S. Epiphanius.

(14) Ad cap. 4. Ose. Aug. hær. 54.

(15) Cont. Vigilant. c. 1. Cont. Heluid. c. 10.

(16) Hær. 30. & cont. Faust. l. 30. c. 4.

(17) Hær. 30.

S. Damascene (18) reproueth the Lampetians for teaching that Monkes ought to be free in their Monasteries, and not subiect to any Superiour. S. Hierome impugneth Vigilantius for defending that it was better for a man to keep his goods, and out of them to giue Almes, then to giue all away at once. The same heresies are the ordinary Tenets generally maintained by all New Sectaries.

(18) Hær. 98.

(19) Cont. Vigilant.

Protestant Errours.

It is wonderfull to obserue the grosse Errours that the Enemies of Perfection do ordinaly fall into. No man could possibly imagine that any man but a Luther (20) would affirme, that women were created for no other end but to marry: and that it is all one to aduise whether a man should marry, or whether he should eate or drinke. Who also teacheth that virginity excelleth Marriage, and yet a married wyfe is better before God, then a Virgin: but heer the foole fighteth with himself. Yea such was his lust, that he blusheth not to say, (21) *We conclude, Marriage to be as it were gould, and the spirituall State as dung.* And, (22) *Generation is the chiefest worke, after the preaching of the name of God,* which certainly is the

(20) In Epithalamio.

(21) In 1. Cor. 7. f. 107.

(22) Tom. 6. in Gen. 2. fol. 26.

the reaſon that moueth Prot. preachers to marry ſo faſt,(23) *To marry, and to eate and drinke, neceſsity compelleth to do both alike, and God commandeth both alyke to be done.* Who would not be aſhamed, and afrayd to follow a Religion firſt taught by a man ſo carnall? He (24) thinketh alſo that it would be the beſt forme of Religious Profeſſion, if none ſhould be admitted therto, before he were 70. or 80. yeares of age. With him (25) *a Turke is better then theſe, who haue brought in this horrible errour of Coũſayles.* Peter Martyr: (26) *It is not good for man to be alone, becauſe it is not pleaſant, not honeſt, not profitable.* Heerby we ſee in what carnality our Prot. miniſters do place their action.

(23) Tom. 7. in Ep. ad Wolfang fo. 303.

(24) L. de vobis Monaſticis.

(25) Tom. 4. in c 9. Iſaiæ. fol. 109.

(26) In Theſſ. p. 1002.

SECT. II.

It is proued by Scriptures, that there are Euangelicall Counſayles or workes of ſupererogation: if they be obſerued or done, they are commendable and meritorious; if omitted, not ſinnefull.

TO find out the truth by the ſacred Scriptures, the Prophet Iſay writeth: (1) *Let not the Eunuch ſay, Behould I am a dry tree, becauſe thus ſayth our Lord to Eunuches: They that ſhall keep my Sabotbs, and ſhall chooſe the things that I would, and ſhall bould my Couenant, I will giue vnto them in my bowſe, and within my walls a place and a name better then ſonnes and daughters, an euerlaſting name will I giue them, which ſhall not periſh.* To be without children was ignominious amongſt the Iewes in the Old Teſtament, becauſe God hauing then choſen that only Nation for his peculiar people, the conſeruation and increaſe of his Church dependeth much vpon their multiplication: But ſeeing the Church of Chriſt in the new Teſtament, ſhould be gathered and conſiſt of all Nations, the Prophet heere foreſeweth, that Chriſtian Eunuchs liuing continent, ſhould not be ignoble or inglorious, but more glorious, and haue a better name then (Gods other ſeruants) *ſonnes* and *daughters*: becauſe keeping Gods Preceps (ſuch as was the

(1) C. 56. 4. 5.

Saboth

Saboth) they alſo of their free election, chooſe this ſtate of life to keepe perpetuall Chaſtity, more then is commanded. And that this is ſpoken of voluntary Eunuches, not of ſuch as are ſo borne, or after cut, it is cleere; for there is no reaſon why to theſe ſhould be promiſed greater glory then to thoſe that are maryed: And if it were vnderſtood of theſe who contayne becauſe they cannot do otherwiſe, and ſo to them be promiſed greater gloty then to the maried, then with far greater reaſon is it promiſed to them who will contayne when they might do otherwiſe.

Now that this Continency of Eunuches is not here commanded, but counſailed, appeareth by theſe wordes, *Who will chooſe the thing that pleaſeth me?* for they are ſaid to chooſe, who are not compelled by precept, as alſo in that thoſe who are not Eunuches, are not excluded from the kingdome, which they were if this continency of Eunuches were here commanded. Laſtly, that the ſaid Continency is not only profitable, but likewiſe meritorious of eternall life, is proued by thoſe wordes, *I will giue them an euerlaſting Name that ſhall not perish.*

(1) L. de Cælib. & voti is Monaſt.

But Peter Martyr (1) replyeth, that God doth not here preferre Eunuches before others that keep his law, but only before them that tranſgreſſe the Law: But this doth not ſatisfy, for God here calleth them not tranſgreſſours, but his ſonnes and daughters, before whom he preferreth holy Eunuches: neither ſpeaketh he of ſuch as ſhalbe excluded from good place, or good name, but of ſuch as ſhall enioy both, and ſaith, *Theſe Eunuches ſhall haue a better place and better name.*

(3) Mat. 19. 10.

Agreably hereunto, when the Apoſtles had ſaid, (3) *It is not expedient to marry; our Lord ſaid, Not all take this word, but they to whom it is giuen: for there are Eunuches which were borne ſo from their Mothers wombes; and there are Eunuches which were made ſo by men, and there are Eunuches who haue gelded themſelues for the kingdome of heauen: He that can take, let him take.* Here Continency is not commanded, for in the beginning of the Chapter, Mariage is approued, and yet here it is ſaid, that ſome liued chaſt for the *Kingdome of heauen.* And though Peter (4) Martyr expoundeth theſe wordes, *For the kingdome of heauen,*

(4) De Cælibatu & votis.

heauen, only for the better preaching of the Ghoſpell, yet this is only his owne Imagination without ground: Neither will it agree to many women who liued chaſt, ſurely not for preaching, which to them is prohibited, but for their greater merit in the kingdome of heauen; And I ſee few Proteſtant Miniſters liue Eunuches for the better preaching of the Ghoſpell.

Our Sauiour ſaid vnto the yong man, (5) *If thou wilt be perfect go ſell the thinges that thou haſt, and giue to the poore, and thou ſhalt haue treaſure in heauen, and come follow me.* That theſe wordes import no precept is playne, in that the only obſeruance of the Commandements is alleadged by our Sauiour a little before as neceſſary to ſaluation. As alſo if it were any Precept, it were of charity: now this only exacteth that we loue our Neighbour as our ſelfe; wherfore it doth not bynd vs to giue all that we haue to our Neighbour, but that we may reſerue part for our ſelues. Laſtly if it were a Precept, all whoſoeuer, were bound to giue all that they haue vnto the poore, which is abſurd. (5) *Mat.19. 21.*

D. Fulke (6) and other Prot. reply, that *Chriſt neither Commandeth nor counſeileth this Perfection to all men, but only to this one, to diſcouer the hypocriſy and vaine confidence that he had in himſelfe*: But this inſteed of an anſwere, is a ſclanderous falſhood, for beſydes that the Euangeliſtes do none of them accuſe the yong man of any ſuch fault, no ſooner had he ſaid that he had kept all the Commandements from his youth, but Chriſt thereupon *beholding him, loued him*, as S. Marke (7) witneſſeth; which he would neuer haue done, if he had knowne him to be a lying Hypocrite. Secondly the yong man hearing our Sauiours ſpeach of Perfection, (8) *went away ſorrowfull, for he had many poſſeſsions*, which ſorrow he would neuer haue had, if he had come with a diſſembling mynd. Thirdly, after this his ſorrowfull departure, Peter hereupon agreable to our Sauiours ſaid admonition giuen, ſaid, *Behould* (9) *we haue left all thinges, and followed thee, what therfore ſhall we haue?* To which our Sauiour anſwered not, that he would giue them nothing, or that which he had ſpoken was only to the yong man, and that not ſeriouſly, but

(6) *Againſt Iohn. Teſt. in Mat.19. ſec.9.* Parkins in his Reform. Cath. p.241. Caluin l.4. c.13.ſec.13.

(7) C.10,21.

(8) *Mar.10. 22.*

(9) *Mat.19. 27.*

but only to let him ſee his hypocriſy, as Prot. expound it; but inſteed hereof, he promiſeth them for their reward, (10) *That they ſhall ſit vpon twelue Seates, iudging the twelue Tribes of Iſrael:* Yea to euery one whoſoeuer that (11) *hath left houſe, brethren &c. or lands for his name ſake, he hath promiſed they ſhall receiue an hundred fold, and ſhall poſſeſſe lyfe euerlaſting.* But M. Perkins limiteth thoſe words, *If thou wilt be perfect &c.* to that only man, ſaying (12) *Thoſe words containe a perſonall and particuler command.* But this to be moſt falſe appeareth, in that Chriſt expreſly diſtinguiſheth here matters of Command, from matters of Perfection. But whether it be command or counſaile, it is ridiculous to apropriate the ſame to that only man: and cleerly moſt falſe, in that the Apoſtles immediatly after affirmed of themſelues that, *they had left all things and followed Chriſt.*

(10) *Mat.* 19. 28.

(11) *Ver.* 29.

(12) Caſes of Conſcience l. 3. c. 4. col. 1026.

Againſt the ſtate of Perfection Caluin (13) writeth, *Both the Greeke and Latin (writers) do interpret this word (perfectum) perfect: But becauſe in later ages the name of Perfection hath been ill expounded, it is better to vſe the word, Integrity. For many that are ignorant, do thinke, when a man is called perfect, thence to follow that Perfection may be found in vs, whileſt we are conuerſant in this lyfe.* So diſpleaſing is to Caluin the ſtate, and the very word of Perfection.

(13) *Concion* 2. *in Iob.*

In the tyme of the Apoſtles themſelues, many Chriſtians, (14) *who were owners of lands or houſes, ſould, and brought the price of thoſe thinges which they ſould, and layd it before the feet of the Apoſtles; And to euery one was deuided according as euery one had need.* That this was commanded we do not read in any part of the Scriptures, but to the contrary to Ananias it was ſaid, (15) *Remayning, did it not remayne to thee, and being ſould, was it not in thy power?*

(14) *Act.* 4. 34. 35. 37.

(15) *Act.* 5. 4.

D. Fulkes anſwere hereto is, that, (16) *Neither can it be proued that they promiſed the whole, but they affirmed they brought the whole, when they withdrew part.* But this is ſo falſe, that D. Fulke himſelfe a litle after confuteth it, ſaying, (17) *They that haue as great power to keep the vow of Virginity aduiſedly made, as Ananias had to deliuer the whole price of his land, ſinne damnably if they breake it;* Where he muſt needs ſuppoſe, that Ananias had

(16) Againſt Rhem. Teſt. in Act. 5. 2.

(17) *Ibid. in Act.* 5. 6.

had made a vow of giuing the whole, as the other had made a vow of keeping Virginity, otherwiſe their ſinne could not be alyke damnable.

S. Paul teacheth in expreſſe wordes the difference betwene *Counſaile* and *Command*, ſaying, (18) *I ſay to the vnmaried and to widdowes, it is good for them if they ſo abyde, euen as I alſo; but if they do not contayne themſelues, let them marry*: (19) *Concerning Virgines a Commandement of our Lord I haue not, but Counſaile I giue*: (20) *Art thou looſe from a wyfe? Seeke not a wyfe, but if thou take a wyfe, thou haſt not ſinned*: (21) *He that ioyneth his Virgin in Matrimony, doth well, and he that ioyneth not, doth better; Let the widow* (22) *marry to whom ſhe will, only in our Lord, but more bleſſed ſhall ſhe be, if ſhe ſo remayne, according to my Counſaile*. Theſe Textes are ſo plaine to diſtinguiſh *Counſailes* from *Commandes*, and to the praiſe and aduiſe of Counſailes, that no Catholicke at this day can ſpeake more cleerly.

(18) 1. Cor. 7. 8. 9.
(19) Ver. 25.
(20) Ver. 28.
(21) Ver 38.
(22) Ver. 39. 40.

Yet Caluin anſwereth (23) to theſe ſo plaine Textes, that they are not to be taken abſolutely, but conditionally, and that the meaning is only this, that to liue chaſt is good if a man could, but (24) *becauſe of Fornication, let euery man haue his owne wyfe*: euen as it were good (ſaith (25) Caluin) for a man not to eate or drinke, if it might be, but becauſe it cannot be without a miracle, therfore let euery one eate & drinke. But firſt the wordes of S. Paul are cleere to the contrary, for he ſayth not, *It were good for a man not to touch a woman, or I would giue Counſaile*, (but) *It is good &c. I do giue Counſaile*. Secondly, if to liue chaſt, were ſo impoſſible, as Prot. Miniſters both by their wordes and liues make ſhow of, then would S. Paul neuer haue ſo highly commended it: yea how abſurd a thing had it bene, may appeare by applying the wordes of S. Paul to the Example of Caluin, as if he had ſaid, *It is good for a man not to eate: wanteſt thou meate, ſeeke not for meate: of not eating I haue no Precept of our Lord, but I giue Counſaile that no man eate*, and the like. This abſurdity conuinceth, that S. Paul ſpeaketh not of any impoſſibility. Thirdly, by thoſe wordes, *becauſe of fornication, let euery man haue his owne wyfe*, S. Paul doth not admoniſh euery man to marry, but that the marryed man do keep his owne wyfe,

(23) In. 1. Cor. 7. 25.
(24) 1. Cor. 7. 2.
(25) *In Comment. huius loci.*

and others vnmarryed, that they rather marry then burne, if they perceyue themselues in frequent temptation thereof; and so accordingly he counsaileth that, (26) *If they do not containe themselues, that they marry.* Lastly, if it be as difficult to liue chast, as to liue without meate, in what wicked state liue the fellowes of Colledges in Cambridge and Oxford, and sundry other Ministers abroad, who liue not only, the most dangerous tyme of their youth vnmarryed, but euen many of them all their liues: These men I thinke liue not without meat, and yet without women, I hope themselues at least will acknowledge, and not publickly confesse the contrary, howsoeuer the case truly standeth with them.

(26) *Vers.* 9.

But the truth is, the foresayd wordes of S. Paul, *As conterning virgins a Commandement of our Lord I haue not, but Counsaile I giue*, are so cleer and vnanswerable, as that the Rhemistes therupon truly inferring, that a Counsayle is one thing, a Commandement another; D. Fulke who vndertaketh to make some answere or other to whatsoeuer they shal say, yet heer is content to passe it ouer in deepest silence not so much as taking the least notice thereof: which certainly could be for no other cause, but that the words were so splendent, as that his bleared eyes were not able to behould them.

S. Paul might haue receiued (27) *maintenance* for his preaching, yet, *he vsed not* (28) *this power*, but, *being free*, (29) *made himselfe the seruant of all, that he might gayne the more*: and, so (30) *preached the Ghospell without cost, for which he expected a reward*, (31) *and glory* (32) *so great, that it was good for him to dye rather then that any man should make his glory voyd.* Heere S. Paul might haue taken maintenance for his preaching, and yet preached without cost to his auditours, for which he hoped for a reward and glory.

(27) 1. Cor. 9. 7. 11. 14.
(28) *Ver.* 12. 15.
(29) *Vers.* 19.
(30) *Ver.* 18.
(31) *Ver.* 17.
(32) *Ver.* 15.

Peter Martyr (33) replyeth heerunto, that S. Paul in sight of God was bound to do the same, though not in the Iudgement of men; for he sayth, (34) *It is good for me to dye rather &c.* Now for a worke not necessary, no man can suffer himselfe to be slayne: and, (35) *If I preach it is no glory to me*, that is, if I receiue gaine of the people, (36) *what is my reward*

(33) *In Comment. huius loci.*
(34) *Ver.* 15.
(35) *Ver.* 16.
(36) *Ver.* 18.

reward then? that preaching the Ghoſpell, I yield the Ghoſpell without Coſt, that I abuſe not my power in the Ghoſpell. But this doth not ſatisfy, for in all this Chapter S. Paul goeth about to proue, that it was lawfull for him to liue at the Charges of the people, which he confirmeth by the Example of the reſt of the (37) *Apoſtles*, by the example of (38) *Souldiers, ſheepheards*, and *husbandmen*, by the *law of* (39) *Moyſes*, and by the (40) *ordination of Chriſt*. Secondly in anſwere to the places cyted, a man may lawfully ſuffer death for a worke not neceſſary or commanded, but only of Perfection, and ſo haue many Virgins beene martyred for refuſing Mariages: ſo alſo by the ſecond place, S. Paul did not thinke, that he ſhould receiue no glory, but only that ſingular glory, which is due to a worke of Perfection. Laſtly, by the word, *abuſe*, is (41) often vnderſtood a full and abſolute power of vſing, as if he had ſayd, that, I vſe not my power in the Ghoſpell as much as I may; and ſo alſo is the Greeke καταχρᾶσθαι, *abuſe*, often taken in a good ſenſe.

(37) *Vers.* 5. 6.
(38) *Ver.* 7.
(39) *Ver.* 8. 9.
(40) *Ver.* 14.
(41) *Chryſoſt. ho.* 8 *de poen. cecum. & Theophil. in hunc locum. Plato Ep.* 8.

Adde yet heerunto, that, to auoid abſurdity, we muſt eyther hould an arbitrary freedome, in the omitting or doing of certayne lawfull actions, as for example, that we may lawfully in our Prayer beſtow tyme and leaſure, and in our Almes giue to the Poore more then in eyther we are bound; or elſe that in theſe, and other our particular actions, there is ſuch a determinate point or period, as that to exceed the ſame, or to be ſhort thereof, were ſinne: which to affirme, is no leſſe abſurd, then ſcrupulous, and troubleſome to all mens Conſciences.

SECT. III.

That the Fathers do expound the Sacred Scriptures anſwerably with Catholikes, in proofe of Euangelicall Counſayles & workes of Supererogation & Perfection.

COncerning the forſayd place of Eſay, S. Auſtine writeth, (1) *Why doſt thou wrangle impious Blindnes? what doſt thou*

(1) *De ſancta Virginit. c.* 15.

thou promiſe only temporall profit to the chaſt Saints? I will giue them an Eternall name, and if perhaps here thou doſt endeauour to take eternall, for long, I add, I heape, I reiterate, it ſhall neuer be wanting: what ſeekeſt thou more? What ſayeſt thou more? This eternall name whatſoeuer it is to the Eunuches of God, which certes ſignifyeth a certaine proper & excellent glory, ſhall not be common with many, although placed in the ſame kingdome, and the ſame houſe: for therfore peraduenture it is called a name, becauſe them, to whom it is giuen, it diſtinguiſheth from the reſt. This place of Eſay is vnderſtood of ſuch as are voluntary chaſt, by ſundry (2) other Fathers.

(2) Hieron. & Cyril. in hunc locum. Baſil. l. de vera Virg. Ambr. in Exhort. ad Virg. Greg. 3. part. Paſtor c. 29.

S. Cyprian in his booke of the habit of Virgines, writeth thus: *Let not them affect to be decked, or to pleaſe others then their Lord, from whom they expect the reward of Virginity, himſelfe ſaying, There are Eunuches who haue gelded themſelues for the kingdome of God.* Againe in the ſame place, *Now when the world is replenished &c. thoſe who can take Continency, liuing after the manner of Ennuches, are gelded to a kingdome: neither doth our Lord command this, but exhorteth; he doth not impoſe the yoake of Neceſsity, when the free Power of the will remayneth. But ſeeing he ſaith, There are* (3) *many manſions with his Father, he ſheweth the lodginges of a better houſe; theſe better lodginges you ſeeke; gelding the deſires of the flesh, you obtayne the reward of a greater grace in heauen.* Wherof alſo ſayth S. Auſtine. (4) *Chriſt prayſing thoſe who haue gelded themſelues, not for this world, but for the kingdome of heauen, ſhall a Chriſtian gainſay it, affirming this to be profitable, for this preſent lyfe, but not for the lyfe to come?* And yet all Prot. will make bould to ſay it.

(3) Io. 14. 2.

(4) De ſancta Virginit. c. 24.

(5) L. de viduis poſt med. and ſee Dorotheus doctrin. 1.

As touching the yong man mentioned in S. Mathew, S. Ambroſe ſayth: *That* (5) *thou mayeſt vnderſtand the difference of Comandement & Counſaile, remember him to whom in the Ghoſpell it was formerly preſcribed, that he ſhould not murther, not commit adultery, not ſpeake falſe witnes; for there is a commandement, where there is punishment of ſinne. But when he had ſaid, that he had kept the Preceptes of the law, a Counſaile is giuen him, that he ſell all thinges and follow our Lord; for theſe things are not giuen vpon Command but vpon Counſaile are beſtowed.* To which ſenſe alſo ſayth S. Auſtine, (6) *The yong man ſaw how he had kept the Commandements of the Law, but the good Maiſter hath diſtinguiſhed the Commande-*

(6) Ep. 89. q. 4. & cont. lit. Petil. l. 2. c. 104. & in Pſ. 103 And ſee Chryſoſt. in illud ad Roman. Saluta te Priſcam &c. Hieron. Ep. ad Demetr. 8. q. c. 7.

mandements of the law, from this more excellent Perfection: for there he ſaid, if thou wilt come to lyfe, keepe the Commandements, but here, If thou wilt be perfect, go, ſell all thinges &c. And the like Expoſition is giuen by S. Hierome in his booke againſt Vigilantius.

But S. Auſtine is ſo cleere in this, that M. Trig ſayth, (7) *S. Auſtine counting it a degree of Perfection in Chriſtianity, not to ſeeke after the riches of the world, thus writes of himſelfe: I who write theſe thinges haue loued that Perfection, whereof our Lord ſpake to the yong man, Go, and ſell all thou haſt: How far I haue gone forward in this way of Perfection, I know more then any other &c. And to this purpoſe with all my might I exhort others, and &c. haue Companions to whom this is perſuaded by my miniſtery.* (7) Vpon Iude p. 212. See Aug. Ep. 89.

S. Auſtine alluding to thoſe wordes of the Samaritan; (8) *Whatſoeuer thou ſhalt ſupererogate, I, at my returne, will repay thee,* ſaith: (9) *Thoſe thinges are exacted, theſe are offered; if theſe be done, they are commended, if thoſe be not done, they are condemned; in thoſe our Lord commandeth what is debt, but in theſe if you ſhall any thing ſupererogate, at his returne he will repay you.* And againe: (10) *One thing is Counſaile, another Command &c. He that willingly heareth Counſaile & doth it, ſhall haue greater glory; he that fulfilleth not the Commandement, vnleſſe he repent cannot eſcape punishment.* What can be vttered more cleere for Euangelicall Counſails? (8) *Luc. 10. 35.* (9) *De Virginit. c. 30.* (10) *De Temp. ſer. 82.*

Now in proofe of S. Paul his counſailing of Virginity, S. Auſtine expoundeth his words wholly agreably with our Catholike Doctrine, ſaying, (11) *There is no Cõmandment of our Lord concerning Virgins &c. and, becauſe life Eternal is to be gone vnto, wherein there is a certayne excellent glory, not to be giuen to all who are to liue there for euer, but to ſome, for the gaining whereof, it ſufficeth not to be freed from ſinne, vnleſſe to the Redeemer ſomewhat be vowed, which were no ſinne not to haue vowed, & yet to haue vowed and performed were prayſe; therefore the Apoſtle ſayth, But I giue Counſaile.* Agayne, (12) *one thing is Counſayle, another Command, Counſaile is giuen that virginity be kept, that flesh be abſtayned from, that all things be ſould and giuen to the poore. But command is, that Iuſtice be kept &c. He that willingly heareth and doth counſayle, ſhall haue greater glory, he that ſhall not fulfill the Commandement, vnleſſe he* (11) *De Temp. ſer. 82.* (11) *De ſancta Virginit. c. 14. 15. 30. & de Verb. Apoſt. ſerm 28 prope fin. Hypog l. 3. c. 8.*

he shall do penance, cannot eſcape ſinne.

(11) Ep. 22. c. 8.

The ſame Expoſition of S. Paules words are given by S. Hierome: (13) *Concerning Virgines the Apoſtle ſayth, I haue no Commandement of our Lord. Wherfore? becauſe that himſelfe ſhould be a Virgin was no command, but his owne will,*

(14) Hom. 30. quæ eſt 8. de pœnitentia.

S. Chryſoſtome thus explaineth the ſame much more largely: (14) *Do not accuſe our Lord, he doth not Command impoſſible things, many do exceed the Commandements themſelues. Therefore if they were impoſſible, they would not of their owne accord exceed them. He no where commandeth virginity, and many keep it, he no where commandeth to poſſeſſe no goods, and many giue from themſelues their owne ſubſtance, the very workes giuing Teſtimony, that there is great facility in the lawes of the Cõmandments. They would not therforehaue exceeded them, vnles thoſe things which are commanded were eaſy. He commanded not Virginity, for he that commandeth Virginity, ſubiecteth alſo him that is not willing to the neceſsity of the law, but he that admoniſheth, leaueth the hearer Lord of his owne will. Therefore Paul ſayd of* (15) *Virgins, I haue no Commandement, but I giue Counſayle. Thou ſeeſt not a Commandement, but a Counſayle. Thou ſeeſt not a Precept, but an admonition. The one, ſayth he, is of Neceſsity, the other of will. I do not command, ſaith he, that I may not burden: I admoniſh and giue Counſayle, that I may perſuade.* A pure Papiſt was *S. Chryſoſtome.*

(15) 1. Cor. 7. c. 25.

(16) Serm. de Natiuit. Chriſti.

Yet no leſſe cleere heerein is S. Cyprian, (16) *Concerning Virgines the Apoſtle ſayth, I haue no Precept of our Lord, but I giue Counſayle &c. Becauſe although Marriage be good, yet Continency is better, and Virginity more excellent, which not Neceſsity or Command compelleth, but the Counſayle of Perfection perſuadeth.*

(17) L. 10. in Ep. ad Rom. c. 15 poſt. med.

Laſtly, Origen, ſayth, (17) *Thoſe things which we do about debt, we do not by Command; for example, Virginity is not payd of debt, for it is not asked by Command, but offered about debt. Finally, heare Paul ſaying of Virgines, I haue no Precept of our Lord.*

(18) De Adulter. Conin. l. 1. c. 14. And ſee l. de opere Monachorum. c. 5.

S. Auſtine repeateth many things done by Chriſt and his Apoſtles not commanded, but counſayled, ſaying: (18) *Many things are to be done, the Law not commanding, but vpon free Charity, and thoſe things in our ſeruices are more gratefull, which when we might lawfully not beſtow, yet for Charity we do them: wherupon our Lord himſelfe, when he had ſhewed that he owed not tribute,*

bute, yet he payd it, least he should ſcandalize &c. How the Apoſtle commandeth theſe things, his wordes do teſtify, where he ſayth, (19) *Whereas I was free of all, I made my ſelfe the ſeruant of all, that I might gaine the more*; when he had ſaid a litle before, *Haue not we power to eate and drinke? haue we not power to lead about a woman, a ſiſter, as alſo the reſt of the Apoſtles &c. Who euer playeth the ſouldiar at his owne charges? who planteth a vine, and eateth not of the fruite therof? &c. thus he sheweth thoſe thinges which are lawfull, that is, which are forbidden by no Precept of our Lord &c.* So manifeſt it is according to the Fathers Expoſition of the Scriptures, that many thinges are lawfull, laudable, and Counſailed, which are no where commanded by any Precept.

(19) 1. Cor. 9. 19.

SECT. IV.

That Prot. do agree with Catholickes in the Doctrine of Euangelicall Counſailes, and workes of Supererogation.

TO come now to our Prot. writers expounding the Scriptures for Euangelicall Counſailes, and believing the ſame truth; D. Humfrey teſtifieth that, the Waldenſes *did leaue* (1) *all things, and follow the Euangelicall Perfection, profeſsing a kind of Monaſticall lyfe:* and the ſame is reported of them by Luther; (2) who alſo affirmeth, that, (3) *Iohn Huſſe believed the Euangelicall Counſailes:* And Huſſe himſelfe ſayth, Paul (4) *sheweth, that though both be good, yet Virginity is better then Mariage.* Againe, (5) *one is ſaid more perfect then another, in as much as he doth not only keepe the Commandements, which are of neceſsity, but alſo Counſailes, which are of ſupererogation. And ſo Chriſt ſaith, Mat. 19. If thou wilt be perfect go and ſell all that thou haſt, and giue to the poore, and comming follow me.* Hereof alſo ſayth Luther, (6) *Iohn Huſſe &c. affirmed 12. Euangelicall Counſailes,* & Luther himſelf acknowledgeth that one of (7) *Virginity*, or vnmaried life, though he was content to practiſe the contrary with abhominable ſacriledge.

(1) *Ieſuit. par. 2. rat. 3. p. 170.*
(2) *Loc. com. Lutheri. claſſ. 4. p. 83.*
(3) *In Aſſert. art. 30.*
(4) *1. Cor. c. 7.*
(5) *Tom. 2. f. 243.*
(6) *In Colloq. Latinis To. 2. c. de Sanctis.*
(7) *In Aſſert. art. 30.*
(8) *Enchyrid. de coniugio. p. 412.*

Chemnitius affirmeth of thoſe (8) *who are indued with the*

the guift of Continency, that it is good for them to remayne vnmaryed, and yet if they will marry, they may do it without sinne. And the same is decreed by the Confession (9) of Bohemia in these wordes: *Concerning the Condition of single lyfe Virginity and Widowhood, our Preachers do teach, that euery man hath free liberty, either to choose it to himselfe, or to refuse it: for by way of a Law nothing is Commanded of God to men touching these things &c. And we now teach, that the guift of Chastity, by the peculiar goodnes of God &c. both in tymes past was giuen, and at this day also is giuen to some &c. as Christ his speach doth euidently witnesse &c. And, the Examples of certaine in the Prophetical and Apostolicall writinges, and of Iohn Baptist, and of many Ministers, and women Ministers of the Church, do witnesse this thing.* Againe, *the Lord sayth, Mat. 19.* (10) *Those who haue made themselues Eunuches for the kingdome of heauen, that is, who be such as might be maryed, yet they do omit, and abstaine from it, because of the affection of the inward hart, and their loue towards God and his word.* And a little after, speaking of the Commodities of the single life of the Minister, it sayth, (11) *By these thinges he may with lesse hindrance, and more easily and readily with great leasure, and more commodiously employ his labour to the Saluation of the Church &c. And he may be a more Conuenient Minister then others &c. Yea it is certayne, that by the state of mariage, many lets, many cares, and many thinges, wherby necessary quietnesse is disturbed, are cast in our way: And this is it, which Paul saith, I would that you should be without such Cares; He that is vnmaryed, is carefull for those thinges that pertaine to the Lord, how he may please the Lord &c.* Yea *Paul* (12) *concludeth after this sorte: He is more happy in my Iudgment, if he remayne such a one, that is, vnmarried, then if he mary: and I thinke that I haue the spirit of God. In like sort in comparison of others, there be bountifull and peculiar promises & singuler rewardes offered vnto those that keepe themselues, to wit, that their worthy workes shalbe recompensed with a great reward; and that no man shall in vayne forsake any thing, as house, Father, Brother, so also his wyfe &c. as the Apostles did, for the Lordes Cause.* Here not only Euangelicall Counsailes, but many other Catholicke pointes of Doctrine are taught by these Bohemian Protestantes.

(9) Harmory of Confess. p. 543. 544. 545.

(10) Ib. p. 544.

(11) Ib. 545.

(11) Ib. 546.

(12) *In Mat. c. 19. 10. f. 150.*

Bucer acknowledgeth that, (13) *There are who haue gelded*

gelded themſelues, that is, when they might haue maried, haue of their owne accord choſen ſingle lyfe, and that for the kingdome of heauen, that they may proue themſelues in all thinges holy in body and ſpirit, and that they may adhere vnto him without any diſtraction.

Caluin writing vpon the firſt Epiſtle to the Corinthians cap. 7. 8. confeſſeth that, *This place ſheweth that the Apoſtle was then vnmarryed:* and he directly confuteth Eraſmus teaching, that *S. Paul was marryed*: yea in (14) ſeuerall places he preferreth ſingle lyfe before Marriage, and concludeth thus, *The ſumme of the whole Diſputation commeth to this, that ſingle lyfe is better then Marriage, becauſe in it is greater liberty, that men may more readily ſerue God.*

(14) *In 1. Cor. 7. in ver. 26. 28. 32. 33. 34. 38.*

(15) *Eccl. Pol. l. 5. ſec. 8. p. 140.*

M. Hooker collecteth and teacheth, vpon certayne of the before alledged Scriptures, that (15) *If when a man may liue in ſtate of Matrimony, he make rather choyce of a contrary lyfe, in regard of S. Paules Iudgement 1. Cor. 7. that which he doth, is manifeſtly grounded vpon the word of God, but not commãded in his word, becauſe without breach of any Commandement, he might do otherwiſe.* And againe, explaining more fully, what (16) *belongeth to the higheſt perfection of man*, he affirmeth, that to do certayne things which we may lawfully *leaue vndone, is of great dignity and acceptance with God*, and, *that moſt ample reward in heauen is layd vp for them:* that, *heervpon dependeth the difference betweene the ſtates of Saintes in glory*; and ſo withall concludeth, that, (17) *God doth approue much more then he doth command.* For which very ſaying, he is charged by ſome Puritanes, (18) *to ſow the ſeed of the Doctrine of workes of Supererogation.* But he, and his Doctrine of the workes of ſupererogation, are defended by (19) D. Couel. And thus we ſee that many of the learneſt Prot. do teach and maintaine from the Scriptures, our Catholicke Doctrine of Euangelicall Counſailes.

(16) *Ib. l. 2. ſec. 8. p. 122.*

(17) *Ibid.*

(18) The Chriſtian letter to M. Hooker. p. 14. 15.

(19) Def. of Hook art. 8. p. 49. 50. 51. 52.

SECT. V.

Obiections from Scriptures againſt Euangelicall Counſailes, are anſwered.

SOme pretend, becauſe Gods (1) Command is, that *thou ſhalt loue thy Lord God from thy whole hart, and with thy whole ſoule, and with thy whole mynd*; that therfore all that we can do, we are bound vnto. Anſw. The word *All*, or *whole*, doth not ſignify all the thoughts of our hart, or all the intention poſſible, ſo that we ſhould be commanded to thinke of nothing elſe in our hart, but only of louing God, and that with greateſt vehemency of loue; but therby is only meant, that we loue God in ſuch ſorte, that in our loue, we preſer or equall nothing with him: ſo the word, *all*, in Scripture is often taken, not abſolutly, but only for many, as (2) *Herod was troubled and all Hieruſalem with him; many* (3) *wonders were done by the Apoſtles in Hieruſalem, and there was great feare in all*, and the like. Secondly in the Prot. ſenſe it were impoſſible to keep this Precept of louing God, whereas the Scriptures (4) teach it not only to be poſſible, *but eaſy*, as ſhalbe proued hereafter; and withall (5) giueth Example of ſuch as kept it with all their hartes.

(1) Mat. 22. 37.
(2) Mat. 2, 3.
(3) Act. 2. 41.
(4) Deut. 30. 11. 13. Luc. 10. 25.
(5) 3. Reg. 14. 8. 4. Reg. 23. 25. Pſ. 118. 20. Eccleſ. 47. 8.

Secondly it is obiected, that (6) *the way to heauen is ſtrait and narrow*, which could not be, if a man can do more, then the law requireth. Anſw. The law of God of its owne nature is hard, and now the harder by the corruption of man, and ſo the *way* is ſaid to be *ſtrait*; but to one that hath Gods Grace (which cureth and perfecteth nature) the ſame law is eaſy, according to that, (7) *My yoake is ſweet, and my burden light:* (8) *And his Commandements are not heauy.*

(6) Mat. 7. 14.
(7) Mat. 11. 30.
(8) 1. Io. 5. 3.

Thirdly ſuch places are vrged, as ſeeme to proue that in all our workes we are wanting, wherfore we do not fulfill the law, & much leſſe do any workes of ſupererogation. So S. Paul ſaid, (9) *With the mynd I ſerue the law of God, but with the flesh, the law of ſinne*; According to Eſay, (10) *All we are*

(9) Rom. 7. 25.
(10) Ga. 64. 6.

are become as one vncleane, and all our Iuſtices as the cloath of a menſtrued woman. King Dauid prayeth, *Enter* (11) *not into Iudgment with thy ſeruant, becauſe no man liuing ſhalbe iuſtifyed in thy ſight.* Anſwere. S. Paul only ſpeaketh of the inuoluntary motions of the Concupiſcence, which are not ſinne, but only the puniſhments of ſinne. Eſay ſpeaketh (according to (12) S. Hierome) in the perſon of grieuous ſinners, who if they did any Workes at leaſt morally good, yet they defiled the ſame with many haynous crimes, whereas the queſtion heer is not of ſinners, but of the iuſt, when we ſay, that a man may not only fullfill the law, but do more then the ſame. That of K. Dauid, (13) S. Auſtine, S. Hierome, and S. Gregory, do all of them expound of veniall ſinnes, in that no man liueth, who offendeth not therein, but theſe not depriuing man of Grace, do not hinder, but that otherwiſe he may be iuſt. (14) Arnobius, S. Hilary, and others do heerby vnderſtand, that no man can be iuſtifyed, if he be compared with God, his Iuſtice being ſo infinitly perfect, that in reſpect thereof, the iuſtice of all men and Angells may ſeeme Iniuſtice, euen as a Candle lighted in the ſunne, ſerueth not to ſhine, but to make a ſhadow, according to that of Iob, (15) *ſhall man be iuſtifyed in compariſon with God?*

(11) Pſ. 142. 2.

(12) *In hunc locum.*

(13) *In hunc Pſ.*

(14) *In hunc locum.*

(15) C. 4. 17.

Fourthly, moſt inſiſt vpon thoſe words of our Sauiour, (16) *When you ſhall haue done all things that are commanded you, ſay, we are vnprofitable ſeruants, we haue done that which we ought to do.* Anſwere. Chriſt heere ſpeaketh expreſſely of thinges *commanded*, not of workes of Perfection. And ſo S. Ambroſe expoundeth it, ſaying. (17) *Thoſe who haue fullfilled the Commandement, may ſay, We are vnprofitable ſeruants, we haue done that which we ought. This the Virgin doth not ſay, nor he who hath ſould his goods, but expecteth rewards layd vp, euen as the holy Apoſtle ſayth, Behould we haue left all things and followed thee, what therefore ſhall we haue? not as an vnprofitable ſeruant doth he ſay, he hath done that which he ought to do, but as profitable to our Lord, who hath multiplied the talents committed vnto him &c.* So cleerely doth S. Ambroſe anſwere his their common Obiection.

(16) Luc. 17. 10.

(17) L. de 9 duis poſt med.

(18) L. 10. in c. 16. ad Rom.

And the ſame anſwer is giuen by (18) Origen. Adde yet heer-

heerũto, that it is not ſayd of thoſe who obſerue the Precepts that *they are vnprofitable ſeruants*, but only it is counſailed that they ſay ſo of themſelues, that is, to be humble, and not to brag of their deſerts. And ſo Chriſt himſelfe calleth not his *ſeruants vnprofitable*, when they haue done their labour, but ſpeaketh thus, (19) *Good and faythfull ſeruant, becauſe thou waſt faythfull in a little, I will place thee ouer much: enter into the ioy of thy Lord.* Yea he affirmeth of ſuch, that he will *not now* (20) *name them ſeruants, but friends.* And S. Paul ſaith expreſſely, (21) *If any man therefore ſhall cleanſe himſelfe from theſe, he ſhalbe a veſſell vnto honour, ſanctifyed and profitable to our Lord, prepared to euery good worke.* So many wayes is this Obiection inſufficient.

(19) *Mat.* 25. 21.

(20) *Io.* 15. 15.

(21) 2. *Tim.* 2. 21.

CHAP.

CHAP. XII.

The State of the Queſtion, concerning Vowes is propoſed.

Whether Vowes of Workes of Perfection, as Poverty, Chaſtity, and Obedience, be Lawfull, and Commendable now in the Law of Grace.

SECT. I.

Catholike Doctrine.

TO examine now what the Church of Chriſt believeth and practiſeth concerning the Vowes of workes of Perfection; in the fourth Carthage Councell it is decreed, that, (1) *If any widdowes &c. haue vowed themſelues to our Lord, and caſting of the lay-habit, ſhall appeare in Religious habit vnder the teſtimony of the Biſhop and the Church, and afterwards haue paſſed to ſecular marriages, according to the Apoſtle, they ſhall haue damnation, becauſe they haue dared to make voyd the fayth of Chaſtity, which they haue vowed to our Lord.* In the ſecond Councell of Arles it is defined that, (2) *Thoſe who after the holy Profeſſion do Apoſtatate, and returne to the world, and do not afterwards ſeeke the remedies of Pennance, ſhall not at all receiue Communion without*

(1) Conc. Carth. 4. c. 104.

(2) Cap. 25.

without Pennance. Whom alſo we command, not to be admitted to the Office of the Clergy. And whoſoeuer he be, after Pennance let him not preſume to take a ſecular habit; but if he ſhall preſume, let him be boulden an Alien from the Church. Agreably to this the Catholicke Church ſtill teacheth, that, (3) A vow being a Religious promiſe of ſome greater good made freely to God, is in it ſelfe lawfull, and a true and proper worſhip of God.

(1) *Bellar. de Monach. l. 2. c. 14 16. & Rhem. Teſt. in Luc. 10. p. 189 & p. 151.*
(4) *Caiet. q. 89. art. 7.*
(5) *Sotus l. 7. de Iuſtitia. q. 2. art. 1. Nauar. in Man. c. 12. n. 40.*
(6) *S. Thom. q. 88. art. 7.*
(7) *Scot. in 4. Diſt. 38.*
(8) *Sotus l. 7. de Iuſtitia. q. 2. art. 5. Richar. in 4. Diſt. 38. art. 7. q. 2.*
(9) *S. Thom. q. 88. art. 11.*
(10) *Richar. in 4. Diſt. 38. art. 9. q. 1. Nauar. in Man. c. 12. n. 72.*
(11) *L. de votis Monaſticis.*
(12) *In Confeſſ. Aug. art. 27 & in Apol. eiuſdem Articuli.*
(13) *In Pſ. 75 & 99.*

Pointes Diſputable.

Some (4) thinke, that the breach of a Vow deliberately made, though in a matter of ſmall moment to be a mortall ſinne: but others (5) more probably teach, that it is but veniall. Some (6) teach, that the ſolemnity of a vow of chaſtity doth eſſentially conſiſt in a certaine ſpirituall Conſecration or Benediction of a Perſon, by which he is made vncapable of marriage. Others (7) affirme, that it eſſentially conſiſteth in the Decree of the Church, forbidding Mariage to them who ſolemnly do vow: Yet others (8) moſt probably thinke, that it conſiſteth in an actuall deliuery of a mans owne power, into the handes of God, and them who ſupply his place. (9) Some teach that the Pope cannot diſpenſe in a ſolemne vow of Chaſtity, made by Profeſſion of Religion: but others (10) affirme the contrary. None of theſe are defyned.

Proteſtants Vntruthes.

Luther (11) auoucheth, that the Primitiue Church & the New Teſtament, were wholly ignorant of the vſe of making Vowes: but this is diſproued in the next 2. & 3. Sections. Melanchthon (12) affirmeth, that in the tyme of S. Auſtine, Monaſteries were free Colledges not tyed to any vowes: but S. Auſtine (13) teacheth expreſly the contrary. He alſo reporteth that Monachiſme is but a late inuention; and that we belieue a Religious lyfe to merit Iuſtification and Remiſſion of ſinnes, & being applyed to others, will ſaue them: but theſe are only his owne fooliſh fictions.

Pro-

Proteſtant Doctrine.

Luther (14) and ſome other Prot. teach, that though vowes of things indifferent, may be made for ſome reſpects, as for the better auoyding of ſinne, & other good ends; yet to do the ſame for any worſhip to God, or as a thing of Perfection, they thinke vnlawfull; but as for the vowes of Poverty, Chaſtity, and Obedience, they vtterly condemne them. According to Perkins, (15) *The vowes of perpetuall Continency, Poverty, and Regulate Obedience, are indeed the ſtate of Abhomination.* And Caluin thinketh, that, (16) *The vow of ſingle lyfe is Rebellion againſt God*, Beza ſayth, (17) *We thinke with the Apoſtle the vow of Perpetuall Chaſtity to be Diabolicall Doctrine*; but where he fyndeth this in any Apoſtle, he doth not mention. *One (18) thing I here add* (ſaith Luther the Apoſtata Fryar) *which I would to God I could perſwade all men, that is, that all vowes might be altogeather taken away or eſchewed*; that is, that all would breake their vowes as himſelfe did. The Decree of Tyndall and Foxe is, (19) *All vowes are againſt the Ordinance of God.* So that Prot. do vtterly condemne all vowes of Perfection.

Proteſtants agree with Ancient Heretickes.

Guido reproueth one Gerhard for teaching that, (20) *It was more Perfection to liue without Vow, then with Vow.* The Lampetians are impugned by S. Damaſcene, (21) for affirming that Monaſteries ought to be free without Perpetuall vowes. And the ſame Error is condemned in the hereticks (22) Fraticelli, and Wicliffe; (23) yea for impugning of Religious men, the Arrians were condemned by S. Athanaſius (24) and other Fathers, and the Donatiſtes by S. Auſtine (25); and conſequently are condemned for Heretickes all Prot. that defend the ſame Errours.

Proteſtant Errours.

Luther (26) thinketh that if a man will vow pioufly, he

(14) *L. de Votis Monaſt. Caluin In Inſtit. l. 4. c. 13. §. 7.*
(15) *Tom. 2. in Gal. 2. Col. Pr.*
(16) *In Reſut. Catalani, pag. 384.*
(17) *In Confeſſ. c. 5. fol. 39.*
(18) *De Cap. Baby. f. 77.*
(19) *Act. Mon. p. 1138.*
(20) *De Erroribus Pſeudoapoſtolorum.*
(21) *Ludo 100. hæreſ. circa fin.*
(22) *Turrian. in Chron. l. 42. Sunnar de Eccl. pauci. 2. f. 47.*
(23) *Walden. to. 3. c. 77. Conc. Conſtan. Seſſ. 8.*
(24) *In vit. S. Antonij. Theodoret. hiſt. l. 2. Raffinus l. 11. hiſt. c. 3.*
(25) *L. 1. cont. Petil. c. 40. & in Pſ. 132.*
(26) *Lude Votis Monaſt.*

he muſt do it in this forme: I vow Pouerty, Chaſtity, and Obedience euen vnto death freely, that is, that I may chãge it when I will. But if he promiſe continency vntill death, how then freely? if freely, how then vntill death? Melanchon (27) auoucheth, that S. Bernard and S. Francis became Religious only for corporall profit. But I perſuade my ſelfe, Melanchon would deeme it little corporall profit for him, to walke barefooted, to weare hayrcloth, to faſt with bread and water, to ſleep vpon the ground & the like corporall auſterities, which theſe good Religious men did vſe, and many others likewiſe at this day.

(27) *In confeſſ. Aug. art. 27. & in Apol. eiuſdem Articuli.*

SECT. II.

It is proued from the Scriptures, that the foreſaid Vowes of Perfection are Lawfull, and Commendable.

THat God was worſhipped by the vowes of the faythfull in all tymes, appeareth firſt by the doctrine of the Old Teſtament, where it is ſayd (1) *Vow yee, and render your vowes vnto God.* (2) *When thou ſhalt vow a vow vnto the Lord thy God, thou ſhalt not be ſlack to pay it, for the Lord thy God will ſurely require it of thee,* and ſundry ſuch like. And accordingly (3) *Iacob vowed a vow, ſaying* &c. And, (4) *Dauid vowed a vow to the God of Iacob.* Now wheras Peter Martyr, Fulke, and others ſeeke to euade, in anſwering that, (5) *vowes were Ceremonies of the old Teſtament &c. abolished by Chriſtes Comming*, this is euidently falſe. Firſt, In that vowes were made euen in the ſtate of Nature before Moyſes tyme, as appeareth by the forementioned vow of Iacob. Secondly, in that vowes are foretold (6) to continue during the New Teſtament. Thirdly, in that, as ſhalbe ſhewed in the next Section, the Ancient Fathers of the Primitiue Church, taught the lawfulnes of vowes. And laſtly, in that the Prot. themſelues, as ſhalbe ſhewed in the 4. Section, do likewiſe proue and maintaine from the Scriptures, the lawfulnes of Chriſtian vowes.

(1) Pſ. 76. 12.
(2) Deut. 23. 21. Num. 30. 3. Eccl. 5. 3.
(3) Gen. 28. 20.
(4) Pſ. 131. 2.
(5) Pet. Mart. de cælib. & vot. p. 302. 303. 304. Fulk. in his Retentiue. p. 153. Bulling. Dec. in Engl. p. 380. Hoſpin. de orig. Monach. fol. 204. Luth. tom. 2. Wittemb. fol. 276.
(6) Eſa. 19. 21. See the Marg. notes of Bible an. 1574.

But to come now to our tyme of Chriſtianity, ſeeing accor-

according to M. Perkins, and other Prot. (7) *Now in the New Testament we haue warrant to vow*, certaine thinges that be lawfull, and *not* (8) *commanded vs*, as for example, (9) *to keepe set tymes of fasting, to take our selues in prayer, to giue set Almes &c.* it hath bene proued in the precedent Chapter, that voluntary Pouerty, Chastity, and the like are workes of Perfection, & lawfull, therfore it euidently followeth, that they may be vowed to God by vs Christians.

(7) *Reform. Catb. p.* 159. *Muscul. loc. com. de votis. p.* 524. *Willet Synop. p.* 241.

(8) *Willet Synop. p.* 241.

(9) *Perk. Ref. Cath. p.* 156.

And to descend to particulars concerning the vow of Pouerty, S. Luke relateth that, (10) *Ananias sould a peece of land, and defrauded of the Price of the land &c. and bringing a certaine Portion laid it at the feet of the Apostles. And Peter said, Ananias, why hath Sathan tempted thy hart, that thou shouldst lye to the holy Ghost, and defraud of the price of the land? Remayning, did it not remayne to thee, and being sould, was it not in thy power? &c. Thou hast not lyed to men, but to God. Ananias, hearing these words, fell downe, and gaue vp the Ghost.* Here the words, *defrauding of the Price, lying not to men, but God*, do conuince, that his sinne was the breach of his vow, he hauing no other Obligation to giue all, or any portion of the Price.

(10) *Act. 5. 1.*

Wheras D. Fulke and M. Willet do answere herunto, that Ananias his offence was only his false (11) *affirming that he brought the whole, when he withdrew a part*, and so only sinned in lying and couetousnes; but this is but barely said, and indeed is most vntrue, for that he and his wyfe, had vowed with other Christians the Common life, appeareth in that, he *defrauded of the price of the land, his wyfe being priuy therto*; for he could not haue bene said to haue *defrauded*, vnles he had stolne away that which was bound by promise, and which after the said promise or vow so made, was due in Iustice to others no lesse then to himselfe. Now that they vowed a thing not commanded, is cleere by these wordes, *Remayning, did it not remayne to thee, & being sould, was it not in thy power?* And that this vow was made to God, and so the breach sacriledge, these words conuince, *Ananias, why hath Sathan tempted thy hart, that thou shouldst lye to the holy Ghost &c. Thou hast not lyed to men, but to God.* Now what is it to lye to God, but to breake his promise giuen to God? Add yet here-

(11) *Against Rhem. Test. in Act. 5. sec. 4. f.* 191. *Willet Synop. p.* 243.

hereunto, that ſo grieuous a puniſhment as the inflicting of ſodayne death doth ſtrongly argue, that the fault was greater then only a Lye, or Courtouſnes. Yea that it was the breach of a vow, D. Fulke himſelfe telleth vs, ſaying. (12) *They that haue as great power to keepe the vow of Virginity, aduiſedly made, as Ananias had to deliuer the whole price of his land, ſinne damnably if they breake it*: where he muſt needes ſuppoſe that Ananias vowed the giuing of the whole, as the other had vowed the keeping of Virginity, otherwiſe their ſinne could not be alike damnable.

(11) Againſt Rhem. Teſt. in Act. 5. ſect. 4.

To come now to the vow of Chaſtity, that the B. Virgin Mary vowed the ſame, is proued from theſe her words, (13) *How ſhall this be done, becauſe I know not man?* that is, becauſe I cannot know man: for if ſhe had only meant, that as then ſhe had neuer knowne man, then her demand had beene needleſſe, and idle, ſeeing it might haue been eaſily anſwered; that though now ſhe did not, yet ſhortly afterwards ſhe ſhould: whereas the Angell declaring the manner how it ſhould be, inſteed thereof ſayth. (14) *The holy Ghoſt ſhall come vpon thee, and the power of the moſt High ſhall ouerſhadow thee.* But Peter Martyr (15) replyeth, that by the like reaſon Moyſes ſaying, (16) *How ſhall Pharao heare me, being of vncircumciſed lippes? And Nicodemus asking*, (17) *How can a man be borne when he is old?* ſhould thereby, the one vow vncircumciſion of lippes, and the other old age. But this is impertinent, for theſe things not depending of mans free-will, do therefore cauſe ſuch impediments, whether of ſpeaking, or being borne, as cannot be remoued from man, and therefore they prudently asked thoſe queſtions, though they had made no vow of the things, becauſe without all ſuch vow, they had ſuch impediments of ſpeaking, or being borne, as by themſelues they could not remoue: whereas the B. Virgin being marryed, had it in her free power to haue known man; and therfore ſhe had fooliſhly asked, how ſhall this be done, if by no law ſhe had beene hindred to know man; now there was no generall or Common law, or Precept forbidding the ſame, therefore ſome Priuate law, which was her vow.

(13) Luc. 1. 34.

(14) Ver. 35.

(15) De votis.

(16) Ex. 6. 12.

(17) Io. 3. 4.

(18) Mat. 19. 11.

Chriſt

Christ our Sauiour affirmeth that, (18) *There are Eunuches which haue gelded themselues for the kingdome of heauen*; he is not an Eunuch who only containeth, but who cannot but containe; wherfore seeing the Eunuches heere spoken of, are not such by nature, or by cutting, as is plaine by the Text, where 3. seuerall sorts of Eunuches are distinguished; it followeth, they are such by voluntary vow: Also, none can be sayd absolutely to haue gelded themselues, who only for a tyme containe, and afterwards at their pleasure marry.

All that D. Fulke hath to answere to this place is that, (19) *They that are assured of the guift of Chastity vnto their lyues end may lawfully vow, or determine of it, but without such assurance no man can vow continency lawfully.* But this doth nothing satisfy the Text, which affirmeth that some Eunuches did geld themselues, that is, did actually vow Chastity, but of any assurance they had to continue chast, there is no mention. But besides I would know what assurance this is which D. Fulke requireth? Either it is some Reuelation from God of his perseuerance in Chastity, and then none must vow chastity without this Reuelation, which is absurd: Or else it is a confident hope in the assistance of Gods Grace, and his owne good care and endeauours, and this no doubt euery mã hath, who freely & willingly do make the said vow, to the honour of God, so that according to D. Fulke with this ordinary assurance any man may make the vow of Chastity. (18) Against Rhem. Test. in Mat. 19. sect. 12.

S. Paules aduise concerning Widdowes was this, (20) *Let a Widdow be chosen of no lesse then 60. yeares, which hath been the wife of one husband &c. but the yonger widdowes auoyde, for when they shall be wanton in Christ, they will marry, hauing damnation, because they haue made void their first fayth.* Heere it is euident, that whether the Widdow were yong or old, if after she was once chosen, or professed, she married, she thereby incurred damnation, because by her second vow or faith giuen to her carnall husband in marriage, she did cast away her (other) first fayth, or vow made to God, when she was chosen. (20) 1. Tim. 5. 9, 11, 12.

But Luther (22) vnderstandeth by *fayth*, our Christian fayth, or beliefe, which some Widdowes forsooke, that so they (22) L. de Votis Monast.

they might the better mary againe: but beſids that this faith is not properly ſayd to be made voyd, but to be loſt or perish, whereas of vowes it is ſometymes properly ſayd, that they are irritated or made voyd, when they are broken; there was no cauſe why thoſe widdowes, if they had not vowed Chaſtity, might not marry, vnleſſe they fell from the Chriſtian fayth, for who forbad them to marry with Chriſtians? Doth not the Apoſtle ſay of ſuch a one, (22) *Let her mary to whome she will, only in our Lord?* But Luther shalbe answered by one of his owne saying, (23) *In that Luther vnderstandeth this first fayth, of iustifying fayth, and not of the fayth of Chastity, it is playnly inforced. Which opinion, as he was the first that had it, so was it without the assent of any learned man, and againſt Paul. The Apoſtle speaketh of the fayth, or vow of office &c. but because Paul blamed them, that they would after marry, it is moſt cleere that this Condition was in their vow.* Caluin (24) answereth, that they ſinned returning to mariage, in that withall they gaue themſelues to all wantones, according to that, *when they shalbe wanton in Chriſt, they will marry.*

(21) 1. Cor. 7. 39.

(21) *Antichriſtus ſiue Prognoſtica ſinis mundi p. 148. 149.*

(24) *Inſt. l. 4. c. 13. n. 18.*

In anſwere heerto, ſome vnderſtand (25) thoſe words of Spirituall delights, with which thoſe Widdowes being repleniſhed in the houſe of God, became vngratefull to their heauenly Spouſe, by deſiring earthly Mariages. Others, (26) of the abundance of temporall things, wherewith they were ſuſtained at the charges of the Church: (27) Others of Carnall fornication, which hauing commited, they withall proceed to marriage. But howſoeuer it be vnderſtood, the anſwere is of no force, for if it be not taken for fornication, then could they be only reprehended, in that they would mary againſt their vow: If it be taken for the ſame, then if they had not vowed, inſteed of reprehenſion, they ſhould haue been much commended, for paſſing from Fornication to honeſt Mariage. Laſtly, Caluin confeſſeth, that they not only ſinned by diſhoneſt lyfe, but *alſo in breaking their fayth giuen to the Church*; which, ſayth he, *was a bond of continuall vnmarryed lyfe*, the breaking whereof was *ſinne and damnation*; but what is this in plaine wordes, but that they had made a vow or promiſe or vnmaryed lyfe? Caluin

(25) *Tertul. l. de Monogamia. Cypr. l. 3. ad Quirinum c. 74.*

(26) *Theodoret & D. Th. in hunc locum.*

(27) *Chryſoſt. in hunc locum. Hier. Ep. ad Ageruchiam de Monog.*

uin yet further replyeth, that by the *firſt fayth* is vnderſtood the fayth *giuen in Baptiſme*: But this is idle, for none at Baptiſme, do promiſe not to marry, therfore why ſhould they be damned marrying after?

A third anſwere yet hath Caluin, that theſe widdowes promiſed Continency, which promiſe they made voyd by marying; but none could make this promiſe but ſuch as were 60. yeares old, and ſo not fit for Mariage, S. Paul ſaying, *Let a Widdow be choſen of noleſſe then* 60. *yeares*. But firſt heere is grãted a Promiſe of Continency, the breach whereof was damnable. Secondly, though the Apoſtle aduiſeth old Widdowes to be choſen, yet not them, but the yong Widdowes he accuſeth, that by marying they will make voyd their *firſt fayth*: which reprehenſion the Apoſtle would not haue giuen to yong Widdowes, if they might not haue vowed. Thirdly, when he ſayth, *Let a Widdow be choſen*, he meaneth not to the vow of Continency, but as ſome (28) thinke to the Prefecture or Order of Diaconeſſes: or as others (29) thinke more probably, to the number of thoſe Widdowes who were maintained by the Church, of which number S. Paul would not haue the yong widdowes to be, both becauſe they were able by their owne labours to maintaine themſelues, as alſo in that it would be greater difficulty to keep them continent, which otherwiſe would tend to the dishonour of the Church and ſcandall of others. So vnanſwerable are our cleereſt Texts of Scripture in proofe of Chriſtian vowes.

(28) *Tertul. l. de Velandis Virg. & l. 1. ad Vxorem.*
(29) *Chryſoſt. & Ambr. in hunc loc. Hier. Ep. ad Saluianum.*

SECT. III.

That the Fathers do expound the foreſaid Scriptures in proofe of the vowes of Pouerty, Chaſtity, and the like.

TO begin with S. Auſtine, he expounding theſe wordes of the Pſalmiſt, *Vow ye and render to our Lord your God*, (1) ſayth of the Chriſtians of his tyme, (1) *One vowth to God* Con-

(1) *In Pſ. 75. 11.*

Conjugall Chastity, that besides his wyfe he will not know another. Others also vow, that although they haue made tryall of such marriage, yet neuer afterwards will, nor desire, or admit any such thing; and these haue vowed something more then the other: Others do vow Virginity it selfe from their very youth, that they will not experience that which others haue, and haue left, and these haue vowed much: other vow their house to be an hospitall to all holy people comming to it, these make a great vow: Another vowes to leaue all the goods he hath, giuing them to the poore, and to enter into a Common life, into the Society of Saintes, this man vowes a great vow. Yea S. Austine gathereth from those words of S. Paul, (2) *As hauing nothing, and possessing all things,* (3) that the Apostles did vow Poverty. See the variety of lawfull and holy vowes, recounted by S. Austine, and practised by the Primitiue Christians, & still continued by Catholickes: but amongst Prot. not so much as euer heard of, that they were euer practised by any one of them.

(1) 2 Cor. 6. 10.
(2) In Ps. 113.

(4) Quæst. 19. in Deuter.
(5) Deuter. 23. 21.
(6) Ps. 65. 13.

Theodoret aduiseth that, (4) *After thou shalt promise any thing to God, thinking the promise to be due, vse diligence that forthwith thou performe it: for this he sayth* (5.) *Thou shalt not slacke to pay thy vow, because our Lord thy God will require it; and it shalbe reputed to thee for sinne.* Afterwardes teaching, *that it is in the power of the mynd to promise or not to promise,* he addeth *but if thou wilt not vow, it shall not be imputed vnto thee; Whereupon also* D. (6) *Dauid, I will pay thee my vowes.* The Fathers with vnanimous consent do expound the Scriptures in behalfe of Ananias his vow, S. Hierome writeth, (7) *Ananias and Saphira fearfull dispensers, yea of double heart, and therfore condemned, because after vow they offered as their owne, & not as his to whom they had once vowed them, and now reserued part to themselues of anothers substance.*

(7) Ep. ad Demetriadem.

(8) De verbis Apost. serm. 27.
(9) De Diuersis. ser. 10. alias 12.

S. Austine, *Whilest he* (8) *withdrew a part of that which he had promised he is condemned both of sacrilege and fraud.* And, *if* (9) *it displeased God to take from the money which they had vowed to God, how is God angry when Chastity is vowed and not kept?* And a little after, *that may be said to a sacred Virgin marying, which Peter said of the money, Thy virginity remayning, did it not remayne to thee, and before thou hadst vowed it, was it not in thy power? For whosoeuer*

ſoeuer haue vowed ſuch things, and haue not payd them, let them not thinke to be condemned to corporall death, but to euerlaſting fyre. A fearefull ſaying for Luther and other Apoſtataes.

S. Chryſoſtome, (10) *Why haſt thou done this? wouldeſt thou haue it? thou ſhouldeſt at the firſt haue kept it, and not promiſed it, but now after thou haſt conſecrated it, thou haſt committed greateſt ſacriledge: for he that ſtealeth other mens goods, peraduenture doth it for the deſire of them, but it was lawfull for thee to haue kept thyne owne, wherefore then dideſt thou conſecrate them, and afterwards take them?* S. Fulgentius, (11) *How euill it is, and how carefully to be eſchewed, if any man, of that which he vowed to God, ſhall endeauour by deadly tranſgreſſion, to retayne or ſteale any thing, let Ananias and Saphira ſerue for Example.*

(10) Ho. 11. in Act. Ap.

(11) Ep. de Debito Coniugali. c. 8.

S. Gregory, (12) *Ananias had vowed money to God, which afterwards he withdrew, being ouercome by the perſuaſion of the Diuell, but thou knoweſt with what death he was punished. If then he were worthy of that death, who tooke away the money that he had giuen to God, conſider what great perill in Gods Iudgement thou ſhalt be worthy of, which haſt withdrawne not money, but thy ſelfe from Almighty God, to whome thou hadſt vowed thy ſelfe vnder the habit or veile of a Monke.* How different are theſe Expoſitions from D. Fulkes, affirming that Ananias his ſinne, was only lying, not breaking any vow.

(12) Lib. ep. 33. ad Venantium. See S. Baſil. de Inſtit. Monach. ſer. 2.

As touching our *B. Virgin Maries vowing of Virginity*, Saint Auſtine writeth, (13) *Chriſt before he was conceyued, had choſen her dedicated to God, of whome he would be borne. This the words ſhew, which Mary gaue to the Angell telling her of her offſpring: How ſayth ſhe, ſhall that be done ſeeing, I know not man? which truly ſhe would not haue ſayd, if ſhe had not formerly vowed herſelfe a Virgin to God. But becauſe the cuſtomes of the Iſraelites did yet refuſe this, ſhe was deſpouſed to a iuſt man, who would not violently take away, but rather preſerue againſt the violent, that which ſhe had vowed.* This is ſo cleere, that D. Fulke ſayth, (14) *Though S. Auſtine gather, that she vowed Virginity, yet it followeth not &c. And although Gregory Nyſſen be of S. Auguſtines opinion &c.*

(13) De S. Virginit. c. 4. Greg. Niſſ. Orat. de Natiu. Dominic. Bern. ſer. 4. ſuper Miſſus eſt. & Sar. ſignum magnum.

(14) Aga. Rhem. Teſt. Luc. 1. 34. ſec. 13.

In like ſort touching the Eunuches, S. Epiphanius writeth, (15) *who were theſe who gelded themſelues for the Kingdome of heauen, but the generous Apoſtles, and Monkes, and Virgins?* Now

(15) Har. 58. Valeſiorum.

that Monkes and Religious Virgins do vow Chaſtity it is certayne. S. Auſtine alluding to this place, ſaith, (16) *He that can take, let him take, but you who haue not yet vowed this, who can take, take.* And, (17) *what can be ſaid more true or more cleere? Chriſt ſaith, Truth ſayth, Vertue and the Wiſdome of God ſayth, thoſe who with godly purpoſe containe themſelues from Mariage, do geld themſelues for the kingdome of heauen. And on the contrary, humane vanity with impious rashnes contendeth, that thoſe who do this, do only auoid the preſent neceſsity of the troubles of Mariage, but in the kingdome of heauen ſhall haue no more then others.* S. Fulgentius expreſly ſaith, (18) *Whoſoeuer hath gelded himſelfe for the kingdome of heauen, and vowed to God Continency in his hart, &c. not only if he be ſtayned with the deadly Cryme of fornication, but alſo if either a man will take a wyfe, or a woman mary, according to the ſentence of the Apoſtle, he ſhall haue damnation, becauſe he hath made his firſt faith voyd.*

(16) De S. Virginit. c. 30.

(17) De S. Virginit. c. 23.

(18) L. de fide c. 3.

In proofe that the widdowes mentioned by S. Paul vowed Chaſtity, S. Auſtine writeth, (19) *What ſaith the Apoſtle of ſome who vowed, and performed not? Hauing damnation* (ſayth he) *becauſe they haue made void their firſt faith; what is this, They haue made void their firſt faith? they haue vowed and not performed.* And the ſame he teacheth moſt plainly in ſundry other places.

(19) In Pſ. 85. de S. Virgin. c. 23. de bono viduitatis, c. 8. 9. ſee de Ciu. Dei. l. 17. c. 4.

In the fourth Carthage Councell it was decreed that, (20) *If any widowes though of yonger yeares &c. haue vowed themſelues to our Lord, and caſting away their Laical habit, haue appeared in Religious habit vnder the Teſtimony of the Biſhop, and the Church, but afterwardes ſhall returne to ſecular mariages, according to the Apoſtle, they ſhall haue damnation, becauſe they dared to make void their faith of Chaſtity, which they had vowed to our Lord.* This Canon is ſo diſliking to Daneus, that he chargeth the Councell and S Auſtine, (21) *with abuſing manifeſtly the word of God*; and as Oſiander thinketh, (22) *This Canon hath great errors in it.* But I ſuppoſe all of Iudgment will giue greater credit to this Expoſition of Scripture, made by this Councell and S. Auſtine, then to any giuen by New Sectaryes.

(20) Can. 104. Conc. Tolet. 4. c. 33.

(21) Prima part. alt. par. 87. p. 1012.

(22) Cent. 5. l. 2. c. 2. p. 20.

S. Epiphanius, (23) *If the who is a widow, and dedicated to God, and afterwardes hath maryed, ſhall haue Iudgment and Condemnation,*

(23) Hær. 61. Apoſtolicorum.

damnation, because she hath cast away her first faith; how much more the Virgin dedicated to God, and maryeth, and being woman against Christ, and casteth away a greater fayth, shall haue Iudgment? S. Chrysostome, (24) *When they haue vowed themselues, they will marry, hauing Damnation, because they haue made void their first faith.* And the same exposition is giuen by sundry other (25) Fathers.

(24) Ho. 15. in 1. Tim.

(25) Tertul. l. de Monog. propè fin. Basil. l. de Virg. post med. Hieron. l. 1. in Iouin. & in c. 44. Ezech. Ambr. Theodor. in hunc locum.

The ancient Fathers did so confessedly allow of vowes, as that Chemnitius sayth, (26) *We are not ignorant that the Fathers allowed the vowes of perpetuall single lyfe, and that they also exhorted them to be Obligatory.* Peter Martyr thinketh (27) *Epiphanius with many other of the Fathers to erre, in that they said, It was sinne to breake such a vow, when need required, and that they badly ascribed it to Apostolicall Tradition.* Caluin, (28) *They say this was obserued from longest memory, that those who would dedicate themselues wholy to our Lord, should bynd themselues with the vow of Chastity: I truly I confesse that this Custome was anciently receaued, but I do not grant that this age was free from all vice.* Hospinian affirmeth further, that, *Not* (29) *only Austine, but other Fathers also erred in the vowed Chastity by mutuall Consent of married Persons.* So cleere and confessed it is, that the Ancient Fathers did expound the Scriptures in behalfe of the lawfull vse of vowes, and that themselues did approue and practise the same Doctrine.

(26) Exam. part. 3. p. 42.

(27) De votis. p. 324.

(28) Instit. l. 4. c. 13. n. 17.

(29) De orig. Monach. fol. 202.

SECT. IV.

That Protestants defend with Catholikes the vowes of Pouerty, Chastity, and the like: And that they confirme the same from the sacred Scriptures.

BVllinger confesseth that in the Old Testament, (1) *The Nazarites, because they should more freely attend vpon God, did of their owne accord, take vpon them a more strict trade of lyfe, then the Common people vsed*: and so (2) *were consecrated to the Lord, by a certayne peculiar kind of liuing*: Of whose Vow and Profession the (3) Scriptures make mention.

(1) Decades in Engl. p. 380.

(2) *Ib.* p. 382.

(3) Numer. 6. 2. 3. 5. 9. 12. 21.

And although (4) D. Fulke wil not acknowledge any *ſacrileage in Ananias*, yet Bullinger affirmeth that, (5) *Peter accuſed Ananias of theft, yea and alſo of ſacrileage*. M. Hooker maintayneth that, (6) *It was indifferent for Ananias to haue ſould or held his poſſeſſions, vntill his ſolemne Vow and promiſe vnto God had ſtrictly bound him one only way*; So confeſſed it is that Ananias vowed, & committed ſacrilege by breaking his vow.

(4) *Aga. Rhem. Teſt. f.* 191.
(5) *Dec. in Engl. dec.* 4. 8. *p.* 717.
(6) *Eccl. Pol. l.* 2. *p.* 103.

Caluin affirmeth of S. Pauls *Widdowes*, that in regard of their attendance vpon the Church, (7) *They had vndertaken the law of a perpetuall vnmarryed lyfe, and that if they marryed they caſt of the Vocation of God &c. and ſinned*. And he is otherwiſe ſo agreable with vs, that as D. Bancroft alledgeth him, (8) *by the wiſe of one husband in that place, he doth* (as doth alſo (9) Marloret) *vnderſtand ſuch a Widdow as was neuer marryed but once*: his (10) *Iudgement* (being that) *there might no Widdow haue attayned to the ſayd Church Office, if ſhe had bene twice marryed*: which expoſition being the ſame with Catholikes concerning Bigamy, is therefore miſliked by (11) Beza, Cartwright, and D. Fulke.

(7) *In Inſtit. l.* 4. *c.* 13. *ſec.* 18.
(8) *Surury p.* 218.
(9) *In* 1. *Tim* 5. 9. *p.* 374.
(10) *Surury p.* 218.
(11) Surucy p. 219. Fulke ag. Rhem. Teſt. in 1. Tim. 5. ſec. 5. fol. 180.

Chemnitius (12) and other, Prot. do confeſſe, that the ſayd *Widdowes made publike profeſſion to liue vnmarryed*; Marloret ſayth more fully of them, (13) *they will marry* (ſayth the Apoſtle) *and truly to marry is of it ſelfe without fault, for marriage is honourable &c. but becauſe they did once giue their fayth to Chriſt the ſpouſe, and the Church, and willingly barred themſelues from mariage, hēce it is &c. that their mariage doth decline to the ignominy of Chriſt*. Another Prot. ſayth, that (14) *Luther vnderſtandeth this firſt faith, of iuſtifying faith, and not of the fayth of Chaſtity, it is plainly inforced &c. the Apoſtle ſpeaketh of the faith, or vow of office &c. But becauſe Paul maketh it a fault, that they would afterwards mary, it is moſt cleere that this Condition paſſed by vow*.

(12) Exam. part. 3. p. 33. 38. Bohemian Confeſſ. in the harmony. p. 544.
(13) *In* 1. *Tim* 5. 11. *pa.* 375.
(14) *Antichriſtus pag.* 148. 149.

With theſe agreeth M. Aliſon, telling how ſome of (15) theſe *yonger widowes through the luſt of youth, do betake themſelues to mariage againe, which*, ſayth he, *though it be a matter lawfull in it ſelfe, yet it is vnlawfull to thoſe, that before God and his Church haue vowed the Contrary. And thus is this place* (of Paul) *expounded by Theophilact, Ambroſe, Bullinger, Claudius, Guilliand, and others*.

(15) Confut. of Browniſme. p. 71.

John

Iohn Huſſe is ſo confident in this, that he wiſheth all to (16) note, according to Hierome, that for ſuch as vow Virginity, it is not only a ſinne to marry, but to will to marry &c. The third impediment of Mariage is a vow made to God, to keep Continency.

(16) In 1. Cor. c. 7.

But what ſhall we expect from Luther? certainly no leſſe then this, that (17) No man can deny that it is commanded by God, that vowes be kept, as the Scripture ſayth, Vow yee and pay, ſo that it is lawfull for no man to diſpute, whether vowes are to be kept. It is Gods Commandement Vow yee and pay. This will deceyue no man but him alone who doth not beleeue, that it is commanded and agreable to truth. Againe, (18) It is ſacriledge, when a Religious man, Prieſt, Nunne, and all others who haue vowed Continency to God to commit fornication &c. It is Sacriledge, where not only Chaſtity is defyled, but she who alſo was offered to God alone, is taken away &c. But this in Prieſtes is rather from the Inſtitution of the Church, then from God, but in Religious men it is moſt grieuous, becauſe they haue of their owne accord conſecrated themſelues to the Lord, and withdrawne themſelues againe. But this being moſt true which Luther here teacheth, what may we thinke is become of Luther, who not only through Pryde and Carnality brcke his owne vowes, which he had made in a Religious lyfe, but withall tooke away her alſo, who was offered to God alone, *Katherine Bore*? But it ſeemes he would haue vs to do what he ſaith, not what himſelfe doth. But howſoeuer, it is manifeſt by the Premiſes, that many of the Primeſt Proteſtantes haue expounded the ſacred Scriptures agreably with Catholickes, in proofe of the lawfull vſe of vowes.

(17) De Eccleſiaſticis & Monaſticis votis. To. 6. Germ. p. 181. 118.

(18) De 10. Præceptis in 6. Præcepto.

SECT. V.

Obiections from Scripture againſt the vowes of Pouerty, Chaſtity, and the like, Anſwered.

PEter Martyr (1) obiecteth, that vowes are only mentioned in the Old Teſtament, not in the New: but when there is mentiõ made of Iudaicall vowes, therfore they only belong

(1) L. De votis & cæremoniis.

belōg to the Iewish Ceremonies. Answ. Though the word, *Vow*, be not in the New Testament, yet the thing it selfe, I haue formerly proued from seuerall places therof: Vsury is mentioned, and forbidden expresly in the Old Testament, in the New Testement it is not expresly mentioned, and yet is forbidden to Christians.

But this Peter further vrgeth, that professing our selues Christians, we are thereby bound to giue our selues wholly to Christ, and therfore no place is left for vowes. Euen as it were ridiculous for a Child to bynd himselfe by Bill or Bond to obey his Father; and therfore were the Israelites forbidden to vow to God the first borne of their cattel, because they were otherwise dew. Anſ. The Iewes were wholly bound to God by reason of their Creation and deliuery from Ægypt, and yet according to Prot. they might lawfully vow. Wherfore true is it, that all we haue, we haue from God, who if he pleased might require it from vs againe, and we bound to do what he commandeth; But because he leaueth to vs many things free, in which according to our liberty, we may do this or that, therfore many things are both Gods and ours; Gods, because by his guift we haue them; ours, because we may freely dispose them, so that it be not against God, and of these we may therfore vow. And so a sonne may bynd himselfe to his Father in those thinges, which are in his owne power, of which sort, is to marry or not to marry: So that if he promise to marry, when, and in what sort his Father commandeth, he is bound to performe it. That of the first borne of Cattel, maketh for vs, for the rest of them might be vowed to God, and yet all are Gods guiftes.

The next Obiection is taken from those textes, which affirme that good workes ought to be done freely and voluntarily, not of necessity, which vowes cause: (2) *Euery one as he hath determined in his hart, not of sadnes, or of necessity, for God loueth a cheerfull giuer.* And, (3) *that thy good might be not as it were of necessity, but voluntary.* Answ. These places only speake against Necessity by compulsion or coaction, wherby a man is forced by feare, to do that which willingly he would not,

(2) 2. Cor. 9. 7.
(3) Philem. 14.

not; but as for *neceſsity* which ariſeth by Precept, or vow, which a man at firſt doth voluntarily vndergoe, and afterwards if he will ſinne, hath power and liberty to breake the ſame, this doth ſo well ſtand with the commendation and merit of a good worke, as it doth rather increaſe then diminiſh the ſame. And this is ſo farre from any compulſion, that it is often done with greateſt alacrity, according to that, (4) *The people reioyced when they promiſed vowes of their owne accord, becauſe they did offer them to our Lord with all their hart.* And if at any tyme it fall out otherwiſe, the fault is not in the nature of the vow, but in the vice of the Votary.

Thirdly, (5) are obiected ſuch places, as ſeeme to perſuade marriage to thoſe who ſuffer temptations, and therefore the vow of Continency ſhould be raſh and vnlawfull, ſeeing no man knoweth how long he ſhal liue without the ſayd temptations: (6) *If they do not containe themſelues, let them marry, for it is better to marry, then to be burnt: Becauſe of Fornication let euery one haue his owne wyfe:* (8) *I will therefore the yoger to marry, to bring forth children.* Anſw. In none of theſe places are thoſe called to marriage who only are tempted, but who liue incontinently: for firſt the words are, *becauſe of Fornication: If they do not containe: for your incontinency*, and the like. And this Expoſition is made by ſundry (9) fathers. Beſids, (10) Saint Paul, (11) S. Hierome, and ſundry others haue ſuffered many temptatiõs of the fleſh, & yet neuer marryed, which they had beene bound vnto, if the Obiection were of force: Yea ſeeing according to Prot. all motions of the fleſh, euen the moſt inuoluntary are mortall ſinnes, and none without ſpeciall Priuiledge are free therof, it followeth, that all without exception were bound to marry, which is againſt common, and allowable practiſe.

Secondly, though by *burning* we vnderſtood not only Incontinency, but euen euery Temptation, yet in none of theſe places obiected is there found any *Command*, but only a permiſſion of Mariage, *as let them marry, let them haue a wyfe:* and ſo is this place vnderſtood by ſeuerall (12) Fathers. Beſides this is confirmed by the reaſon giuen by S. Paul, ſaying, *It is better to marry, then to be burne*, for this concludeth not, that

(4) 1. Paral. 29. 9.
(5) Rogers Def of the Art. art. 32. p. 388.
(6) 1. Cor. 7. 9.
(7) *Ver.* 2.
(8) 1. Tim. 5. 14.
(9) Clem. Alex. l. 4. ſtrom. init. Hieron. in Apol. pro libris cont. Iouin. Aug. l. de S. Virginit. c. 14. & de bono Coniug. c. 10.
(10) 2. Cor. 11. 7. 8. Rom. 7. 15. 16. 19. 23.
(11) Hieron. Ep. 22. ad Euſtoch.
(12) Ambr. l. de viduis. Hieron. Ep. 11. ad Ageruch. Aug. l. de bono viduit. c. 8. Chryſoſt. in hunc locum.

that mariage is neceſſary, but only lawfull, and better then fornication; and yet there is a third thing better then them both, to wit, by faſting, praying, and other holy Exercifes to contayne. As if one ſhould ſay, he that will not fight, let him fly, for it is better to fly, then to be ſlaine; this man doth not forbid fighting, and ouercoming, which is better then either flying, or being ſlaine, but only permitteth flight: So alſo the Apoſtle, when he bad the maryed, who by conſent had contained for a tyme, to returne againe togeather, explicateth himſelfe, ſaying, *but I ſay this by Indulgence, not by Commandent.*

The words, *Let euery one haue his owne wyfe*, are ſpoken of thoſe (according to S. Gregory) (13) who are maried already, whom, for feare of incontinency, he perſwadeth to liue togeather, and this not by Command, but by Indulgence. Laſtly, as he ſayth, *I will therfore the yonger to marry*, ſo he alſo ſaith, *I would all men to be as my ſelfe*: therfore if the firſt ſhould imply a Precept, the ſecond alſo ſhould do the like, and ſo he ſhould command contraries: he therfore wiſheth the one abſolutely, and permitteth the other, in reguard of the weaknes of the yonger widdowes. Thirdly I anſwere, that whether the words obiected, import Permiſſion or Command, yet they concerne nor ſuch as are bound with vow, but only ſuch as are at liberty to marry: & thus is this place vnderſtood by many (14) Fathers.

Fourthly, are obiected ſuch places as teach, that Continency is the guift of God, which is not giuen to all, and therfore that none may vow the ſame, ſeeing that none knoweth whether he hath, or ſtill ſhall haue the ſaid guift, (15) *not all take this word, but they to whom it is giuen; he that can take, let him take.* I (16) *would all men to be as my ſelfe, but euery one hath a proper guift of God, one ſo, and another ſo.* (17) *He that hath determined in his hart, being ſetled, not hauing neceſsity, but hauing power of his owne will &c. to keepe his Virgin, doth well.* Anſwere. Some guiftes of God are giuen to man without his owne cooperation, as health, beauty, prophecy, working of miracles, and the like, and theſe are not in our power, neither can euery man haue them that will, and ſo cannot be vowed. Others depend of Gods grace and aſſiſtance, & withall

(11) In l. Regum. l. 6. c. 2.

(14) Ambr. ad virg. lap. c. 5. l. 2. in Iouin. Aug. l. 2. de Adult. coning. c. 25. & de bono viduit. c. 8. Greg. l. Paſtor. part. 3. Admon. 28. Chryſoſt. l. de Virgm. c 39. & ho. 19. in 1. ad. Cor. Epiph. hær. 61.

(15) Mat 19. 11. 12.

(16) 1. Cor. 7.

(17) Ver. 37. 7.

withall of mans freewill and Election, as to beliue, hope, loue, reſiſt temptations &c. and theſe are alſo moſt truly Gods guifts, becauſe if God by his Grace ſhould not preuent, moue, and helpe vs, we were not able to do any of them; and yet withall they do depend of mans choyce, and are in his power, becauſe though God doth help, yet he doth not compell, or neceſſitate him therto, and in theſe things man is ſayd to haue ability to do good; of which ſort of guifts is Continency, and therefore in our Power. And as they only haue the guift of fayth, who indeed truly beliue, which as we ſee, all do not, according to that, (18) *All men haue not fayth*, and yet all may beliue if they will when they heare the word preached, otherwiſe their Infidelity were no ſin: ſo likewiſe of Continency it is ſayd, *All take not this word, but to whome it is giuen*, and yet all may containe, if they will, becauſe ſufficient Grace thereto is denyed to none. And as it were Childiſh and ridiculous to conclude, that becauſe fayth, hope, charity, reſiſting of temptations &c. are the guifts of God, therefore we ought not to beliue, hope, loue, or reſiſt temptations; ſo though Continency be the guift of God, yet it is abſurd therupon to inferre, that therefore it is vnlawfull to liue a ſingle lyfe. And the ſame Expoſition is giuen by (19) S. Auſtine. But S. Chriſoſtome directly anſwereth this, ſaying, (20) *which things I haue ſpoken, that when thou ſhalt take that from him*, (21) *Euery one hath his proper guift, thou ſhouldeſt not faint in mynd, nor reaſon thus with thy ſelfe; for this matter there is no need of my labour and ſtudy, for Paul hath called it a guift; for he ſayd not ſo, becauſe he would ranke Continency amongſt the number of heauenly guifts, but he called it a guift for modeſty, for he would not haue ſo differed from himſelfe and from Chriſt, whoſe that is, There are Eunuches who haue gelded themſelues for the kingdome of heauen; and that, He that can take, let him take. He ſhould leſſe agree with himſelfe, condemning them who when they had choſen widdowhood, remayned not in that mynd, for if it be a guift, why doſt thou threaten them? Hauing damnation, becauſe they haue made voyd their firſt fayth. For Chriſt neuer puniſheth thoſe who haue not bad guifts, but he alwayes puniſheth thoſe who liue diſhoneſtly.* So many waies is this great Obiection eaſily anſwered.

(18) 2. Theſſ. 3.2.

(19) *De bono viduit. c. 17.*

(20) *L. de virginit. c. 36.*

(21) 1. Cor. 7. 7.

(22) Math. 19.12.

These things obserued; that the guift of Continency (Gods Grace supposed) is euer in our power, may be proued first by such places as plainly teach, that the same is in mans freewill. (23) *Let him do what he will: she sinneth not if she marry.* (24) *There are Eunuches who haue gelded themselues.* (25) *Concerning Virgins a Commandement &c. I haue not, but I giue Counsayle.* (26) *He that can take, let him take:* the two first places expressly teach, that it is in mans will, and power to be Continent; the two later containe an exhortation to the same. Now who of wisdome will exhort men to that which is impossible? And in this sense are these places expounded by many (27) Fathers: neyther doth Peter Martyr satisfy, by answering that these exhortations are directed to those only, who haue the guift of God, for such (according to (28) Bucer) cannot but contayne: if therefore those who haue not the guift, cannot containe, and those who haue it, cannot but contayne, to whome doth Christ, and the Apostle direct their Exhortations?

Secondly, if all cannot contayne that will, then many may lawfully commit fornication; for if the husbād or wife be long languishing, of if he be long detayned, by reason of Captiuity, banishment, or tedious iourneys vpon trafficke or merchandise, then the party tempted, not being in their power (according to Prot.) to containe, might lawfully commit Adultery.

But in these Cases (29) Willet confesseth, that God doth giue possibility and grace to containe, because (as (30) Whitaker answereth) these things are necessarily imposed vpon vs, and not voluntarily, or by our owne default; but the merchants absence vpon aduenture is not inforced, but voluntary, as also the adulterous wife, who through her owne offence, is by her husband lawfully dismissed, & yet she may not marry agayne, (31) *for he that marryeth her* (so) *dismissed, committeth Adultery*: as also the offendour against the state, who is many yeares detained in prison, and his wife not suffered to conuerse with him; in these cases the parties voluntary offences, are the very causes of the Necessity imposed vpon them. And so Willet and Whitaker haue sayd nothing

(21) 1. Cor. 7. 36.
(24) Mat. 19. 12.
(25) 1. Cor. 7. 25.
(26) Mat. 19. 12.
(27) Tertul. de Monog. propè fin. Orig. & Hieron. in illud, Non omnes capiunt. Nazianz. orat. 31. Ambr. l. 1. de virg. cyl. de viduis. Aug. in Psal. 17.
(28) In Matth. 19.
(29) Synop. Controu. 6. 9. 4. p. 250. Calu. Herm. in Mat. 19. 9. Luther serm. de Matrimonio.
(30) Cous. Duracum l. 4. p. 341. 342.
(31) Mat. 5. 33.

nothing to the purpoſe.

To Conclude then this anſwere, where it is ſaid, *All take not this word*, it is not meant, that all are not capable therof, or haue it not in their power, for then in vayne ſhould our Sauiour haue exhorted all hereunto, ſaying, *he that can take, let him take*; but as when it is ſayd, (32) *He that hath eares to heare, let him heare*, it is not meant, that all haue not eares, but all are admoniſhed therby, to vſe that faculty of hearing, which they haue. In the laſt place obiected, *Neceſſity*, doth not ſignify *neceſsity* of Marriage, for want of the guift of Continency, but only extrinſecall neceſſity of the Father, either becauſe his daughter will not liue ſingle, or becauſe himſelfe being a Bondman, is compelled by his maiſter to marry her away.

(32) *Mat.* 13. 9.

Fiftly, many obiect, that if all ſhould containe, the world would periſh. But S. Hierome (33) and S. Auſtine anſwere, that there is no danger therof, ſeeing there will alwayes be more imperfect, then perfect. Yea S. Auſtine thinketh, that though the world ſhould periſh therby, yet it were good for all to contayne. His wordes are theſe (34) *I haue knowne ſome who murmur* (doubtleſſe our Prot. Predeceſſours) *what, ſay they, if all would abſtaine from generation, how ſhould mankind ſubſiſt? I would to God all would this only in Chaſtity from a pure hart, and good Conſcience, and faith vnfaigned; much ſooner would the City of God be filled, and the end of the world would be haſtened. What elſe doth it appeare that the Apoſtle doth exhort, where he ſayth, when he ſpoke therof, I would haue all to be as my ſelfe: or in another place,* (35) *This therfore I ſay Brethren, the tyme is short, it remayneth that they alſo which haue wyues, be as though they had not &c. For the figure of this world paſſeth away: But I would haue you to be without careſulnes.* So cleerly Saint Auſtine anſwereth this Obiection. But if in that extremity of the worldes periſhing, men were bound to returne to marriage, the former vow were no let, ſeeing that vowes bynd not, when Gods law preſcribeth otherwiſe, as in this Caſe it would.

(33) *L. 1. in Iouin. Aug. de bono Coniugali. c. 10.*

(34) *Ib. & l. de bono viduit. c. 8.*

(35) *1. Cor. 7. 29.*

Sixtly, Propenſion to Generation is naturall & good, as being when nature was perfect and continuing in all li-

uing Creatures, wherfore to hinder the ſame altogeather by vow of ſingle lyfe, is ſinfull, ſeeing this is to reſiſt nature, & God himſelfe who ordayned nature. Anſw. The naturall inclination of man is twofold; one, to a thing abſolutely, & as it is conſidered in it ſelfe; another, as it is conſidered with all Circumſtances. If we conſider death, ſicknes, and the like, as they are in themſelues, we diſlike and abhorre them: but if we conſider them as matter of patience, the way to heauen, and occaſion to glorify God, we loue and deſire them. Now becauſe this later propenſion only is truly and properly humane, as being according to true iudgment and reaſon, therfore to do againſt this, is ſinne: But ſingle lyfe is only againſt the former propenſion, and agreable with the latter, and therfore there is no offence to do againſt the former.

(36) Heb. 13. 4. Many Prot. obiect thoſe words of S. Paul, (36) *Mariage honourable in all*; therfore the vow of ſingle lyfe is vnlawfull. Anſw. It is honorable in all ſuch as may lawfully marry, & are lawfully married; not in brother and ſiſter, nor in perſons, that haue vowed the contrary, to whom the ſame Apoſtle ſayth, (37) *it is damnable*. Hereof alſo ſayth very well an ancient wryter, (38) *The Apoſtle ſayth, Mariage honourable in all, and the bed vndefyled; and therfore the ſeruants of God, in that they are not married, thinke not the good of Mariage to be a fault, but yet they doubt not perpetuall Continency to be better then good Mariage, ſpecially in this tyme, when it is ſaid of Continency, He that can take, let him take.* But to ſee how Prot. corrupt this place, firſt, they inſert the verbe, *is*, which is not in the Originall. Secondly they make it of the Indicatiue Mood, where it ought rather to be the Imperatiue, *Let Mariage be honourable*, that ſo the ſpeach may be an Exhortation, or Commandement to thoſe that be, or wilbe married, to vſe themſelues in that ſtate in all fidelity, and conſugall Continency. And this is euident by other parts and circumſtances of the place, both before and after, all which are Exhortations according to the Proteſtant Tranſlations: this only being in the middes, and as indifferent to be an Exhortation, as the reſt (by their owne Confeſſion) they reſt rayne of purpoſe. Thirdly, they

(37) 1. Tim. 5. 11.

(38) *De fide ad Petrum. c. 3. apud Aug. in fine.*

they (39) translate, *in all, among all men*, wheras they cannot tell either by the Greeke or Laune, that *in omnibus, in all*, should be the Masculine gender, rather then the Newter (as not only Erasmus, but the Greeke Doctours (40) also take it) to signify that Mariage should be honourably kept in all respects, for there may be many abuses in Wedlock. Fourthly, Beza (41) instead of *in omnibus, in all*, shameth not to translate, *inter quosuis, amongst every one*, with a Marginall interpretation to signify all Orders, Conditions, States, and qualities of men. This shamles and impious corrupting of the word of God, doth euidently conuince, that the Textes of Scripture taken and vnderstood in that true sense, which the wordes of themselues do import, do directly make against all such Errors, as these Prot. Corrupters do obstinatly maintaine.

(39) Engl. Bible of 1577.

(40) See S. Chrysost. & Theophilact. *in hunc locum.* Oecumenius in Collect.

(41) *In Nouo Testam. Graeco. Lat.* an. 1565.

CHAP. XIII.

The true State of the Queſtion, Concerning the Marriage of Prieſtes.

Whether the Vow of Chaſtity be ſo annexed to holy Orders, that after Ordination, they who are conſecrated, can neither marry, nor vſe their wyues formerly married.

SECT. I.

Catholike Doctrine.

I DO not heere diſpute of Prot. Biſhops and Miniſters, who being meerly lay men, and deuoyd of all ſacred Ordination, no man doubteth but that they may lawfully marry, & enioy their wyues, and all their Neighbours will profeſſe it to be expedient: But the Queſtion heere is, onely of Catholicke Biſhops and Prieſts duly conſecrated. Concerning whome, in the firſt Councell of Nice, is was decreed that, (1) *Biſhops do not dwell with women &c.* And, *the ſame is decreed of euery ſingle Prieſt, and of Deacons vnmarryed:* only after there are excepted, *old women, the Mother, Siſter, Aunt, and Grandmother.*

(1) Can. 4. Arab.

But

But there is no mention or allowance for a wife, which would haue beene in the firſt place, if it had been approued. In the Councell of Neocæſarea it is defined, that, (2) *If a Prieſt ſhall marry, he ſhalbe depoſed from Order: but if he ſhall commit fornication or Adultery, let him be caſt out of the Church, and do Pennance amongſt the Laity.* In the ſecond Councell of Carthage, (3) *By all the Biſhops it is ſayd, It pleaſeth all, that Biſhops, Prieſts, and Deacons, or ſuch as touch the Sacraments, keepers of Chaſtity, ſhall abſtayne euen from wyues.* And it giueth this good reaſon thereof, *that what the Apoſtles haue taught, and Antiquity it ſelfe hath obſerued, we alſo may keepe.* And the ſame is defined by ſundry other (4) Councels: and is the (5) generall Doctrine and practiſe of the preſent Catholike Church.

(2) Can. 1.

(3) Cap. 2.

(4) Conc. Elibertin. c. 33. Conc. Arelat. 1. c. 2. Conc. Latera. Seſſ. 9. Reformationes Curiæ &c.

(5) Bellar. de Clericis l. 1. c. 19. Rhem. Teſt. in 1 Tim. 3.

Pointes Diſputable.

Some (6) thinke that the vow of Chaſtity made by Prieſts, is ordained by Gods Law, and therefore indiſpenſable: but (7) others more truly teach, that it is commanded onely by Decree of the Church, and therefore is diſpenſable.

(6) Maior in 4. Diſt. 24. q. 2.

(7) S. Tho. in 2. 2. q. 88 art. 11.

Proteſtants vntruthes.

Melanchthon (8) auerreth that the firſt law impoſed vpon Clergy men for ſingle lyfe, was in Germany, ſome 400. yeares agoe: And that no ſuch law is to be found in any Councell, but was only brought in by the Pope, againſt the mynd of the Councells. But all this is diſproued by the Councells heere before cyted.

(8) In Confeſſ. Auguſt. art. 23.

Caluin (9) auoucheth that all the Ancient Fathers allowed Mariage in Biſhops: But this to be falſe, wilbe yet further ſhewed in the next 3. Section following. Rogers falſly affirmeth vs to teach that, (10) *None may be a Prieſt though he will vow a ſingle lyfe, if he haue bene a maried man:* for this he cueth *the Rhemiſts in* 1. *Tim.* 3. 2. But there is not any ſuch thing to be found: and the falſhood herof is conuinced, by the frequent practiſe to the contrary, in the Catholicke Church.

(9) Inſtit. l. 4. c. 12. §. 32.

(10) Def. of the Articl. art. 23 p. 287.

The

The English Church decreeth that, (11) *Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, are not commanded by Gods Law, either to vow the state of single lyfe, or to abstaine from Mariage. Therfore it is lawfull also for them, as for all other Christian men, to marry at their owne discretion, as they shall iudge the same to serue better for Godlines.* And the same is taught (12) generally by all Protestantes.

(11) Article 32.
(12) See the Harm. of Conf. p. 348. &c.

Protestants agree with Ancient Hereticks.

S. Hierome writing against Vigilantius for his impugning the single life of Priests, relateth the generall practise of the Church of thosetymes, saying, (13) *What do the Churches of the East, of Aegypt, and of the Sea Apostolike who take Clergy men eyther such as are Virgins, or Continent, or if they haue wyues yet ceasse to be as husbands?* D. Fulke granteth that Iouinian was condemned for, that, (14) *He taught that such as could not containe, though they had vowed virginity, should neuertheles be maryed.* And (15) D. Morton acknowledgeth that *Vigilantius and Iouinian are condemned by S. Hierome* for impugning the vnmaried life of Priests. And so also was Simon Magus by S. Irenæus. (16) And whereas Bellarmine affirmed, that Vigilantius taught, that Ecclesiasticall persons ought to be maryed, Whitaker answereth, (17) *If Vigilantius meant the lawfull mariage of Pastors, in that he thought rightly.* So that the Ancient hereticks Vigilantius and Iouinian, condemned by S. Hierome and S. Austine, are here defended, and followed by our Carnall Ministers.

(13) *Cont. Vigilant. c. 1.*
(14) Answ. to a Counterf. Cath. p. 45. See Hier. l. 2. cont. Iouin. c 14. & 19. & Apol. ad Pamach. c. 8. Epiph. hær. 59.
(15) Prot. Appeal. p. 604.
(16) *L. 2. c. 20.*
(17) *Controu. 2. q. 5 c. 7. p. 516.*

Protestants Errours.

Luther thinketh, (18) *it is impossible, that God approue the vow of Continency, and not rather detest it.* (19) *Increase and multiply is not a Precept, but more then a Precept.* Swinglius auoucheth that, (20) *The sacred Scripture is so far from prohibiting the Ministers of the Church the vse of holy Mariage, as that it doth often command the same.* Yea saith Bullinger, (21) *A Bishop is the Minister of Gods word: but this man ought to be the husband of one wyfe, euen because he is a Bishop.* So that such Prot. Bishops & Ministers

(18) *Tom. 2. de votis fol. 271.*
(19) *Tom. 5. serm de matrim. fol. 119.*
(20) *Tom. 1. in Paræneſi ad Heluetios. fol. 214.*
(21) *In. 1. Tim. 3. pag. 438.*

niſters, as do not marry, do contrary to the command giuen by the Scripture, as theſe Prot. dreame.

SECT. II.

It is gathered from the Scriptures, that the vow of Chaſtity is rightly annexed to holy Orders.

THe vow of Chaſtity in Prieſts not being a Diuine Precept expreſſed in Scripture, but an Apoſtolicall Tradition and law of the Church, it cannot be expected, that cleere Texts of Scripture ſhould be produced for it, yet from thence may be deduced many ſtrong probabilities: as firſt that, in the tyme of the Old Teſtament, Continency from wyues was required, when the husbands were to be buſied in any holy Office. Thoſe that were to eate the Paſchall lambe, were commanded to do the ſame with their (1) *loynes girded*, that is, according to S. Gregory, (2) *obſerning Continency*. When the People of Iſrael were to receiue the law from God, Moyſes commanded, that they ſhould, (3) *be ready againſt the third day, and not come neare* (their) *Wiues*. Achimelech the Prieſt, (4) would not giue *the holy bread to Dauid*, and his company, except they had contayned ſome tyme from women; much more then ought Prieſts now to contayne from wyues, ſeeing they conſecrate, receyue, and giue to others, the body of Chriſt, which was prefigured in that *holy bread*.

(1) Exod. 12. 11.
(2) Greg. ho. 22. ſuper Euang.
(3) Exo. 19. 15.
(4) 1. Reg. 21. 4. 5.

To theſe and ſundry other ſuch places, (5) Caluin anſwereth, that the Leuiticall Prieſts, being types and figures of Chriſt, were to repreſent his Excellency with what purity and ſanctity they could, but now by Chriſtes comming, thoſe figures and ſhadowes are ceaſed. But this helpeth nothing, for as thoſe Prieſts did beare the figure of Chriſt to come, ſo Chriſtian Prieſts repreſent him as comen, and therfore the like and greater purity is required in them. But indeed the chiefe reaſon why the Leuitical Prieſts were to abſtayne from their wiues, was not becauſe they were

(5) Calu. Inſtit. l. 4. c. 12. §. 25.

the figure of Christ, but because they ministred vnto God, for it is sayd, (6) *The Priests that come to the Lord, let them be sanctifyed, least he strike them.* Dauid also was alwayes the figure of Christ, and yet he was only commanded to abstaine from his wife, when he was to eate the hallowed bread.

(6) Ex. 19. 22.

In the New Testament S. Paul teacheth, that a Bishop must be giuen (7) *to Hospitality, gentle, sober, iust, holy, Continent:* he sayth to S. Timothy, (8) *Labour thou as a good soldiar of Christ Iesus: no man being a soldiar to God, intangleth himselfe with secular busineßes*, but the state of marriage necessarily causeth many secular busineßes and cares. He counsayleth the married, (9) *by consent to contayne for a tyme, that they may giue themselues to prayer.* Wherefore Clergy men ought still to contayne, seeing daily they ought to perfist in prayer.

(7) Ep. ad Tit. c. 1. 8.
(8) 2. Ep. 2. 3. 4.
(9) 1. Cor. 7. 5.

SECT. III.

The Fathers do gather from the Scriptures, that the Vow of Chastity is rightly annexed to holy Orders.

IN the second Carthage Councell it is thus decreed, (1) *It pleaseth vs all, that Bishops, Priests, Deacons, or those who handle the Sacraments, keepers of Chastity, shall abstaine themselues euen from wyues, that what the Apostles haue taught, and antiquity it selfe hath obserued, we also may keep.* (2) *If the prayer of the iust* (sayth Origen) *be offered as incense in the sight of our Lord &c. And the Apostle sayth to them who are marryed,* (3) *Defraud not one another, except perhaps by consent for a tyme, that you may giue your selfe to prayer; it is certayne that the daily Sacrifice is hindred by them who serue the necesities of mariage; whereupon it seemeth to me, that he only is to offer the dayly Sacrifice, who hath vowed himselfe to daily & perpetuall Chastity.*

(1) Can. 2.
(2) In Numer. ho. 23. Epiph. hær. 30. Ambr. in. 1. Tim. c. 3.
(3) 1. Cor. 7. 5.

Agreably heerto sayth S. Hierome, (4) *If a lay man &c. cannot pray vnleße he want the duty of mariage; a Priest must alwayes pray, who alwaies must offer sacrifice for the people. If he must alwayes pray therfore he must alwayes want mariage: for in the Old law they who offered hoßes for the people, not only were not in their owne*

(4) L. 1. cont. Iouin. c. 19.

bowſes, but were puriſied for a tyme, ſeparated from their wyues, and they did not drinke wyne and ſicer, which prouoke luſt. Maryed men are choſen to be Prieſtes, becauſe there are not ſo many Virgins, as are neceſſary to be Prieſtes. Againe, (5) *If married men take it ill, let them not be angry at me, but at the holy Scriptures, yea at Biſhopes, Prieſtes, and Deacons, and at all the Prieſtly and Leuiticall Quyre, who know they cannot offer Sacrifice, if they ſerue the act of Marriage.* And, (6) *If the Laity be commanded, that for prayer they abſtaine from the company of their wyues, what is to be thought of a Biſhop, who daily is to offer vnſpotted Sacrifices to God for his owne, and the peoples ſinnes? Let vs read the bookes of kinges, and we ſhall fynd, that the Prieſt Achimelech would not giue to Dauid and his ſeruants the bread of Propoſition, vntill he had demanded whether they were pure from women, not only ſtrangers, but their owne wyues. And vnleſſe he had heard, that for two dayes they had forborne the act of Marriage, he would not haue giuen them the bread, which formerly he had dewyed. There is ſo great difference betwene the bread of Propoſition, & the body of Chriſt, as betwene a ſhadow and a body, betwene an Image and the truth, betwene the patternes of things to come, and the things themſelues which are prefigured by thoſe Patternes.* And (7) he proueth, that the Apoſtles after they were called to follow Chriſt, had no more carnall company of their wyues, by thoſe wordes of our Sauiour, (8) *He that hath left wyfe &c.* But the Fathers Doctrine and practiſe, were ſo cleere in behalfe of the vnmaryed life of Prieſtes, that Iewell ſayth, (9) *Here I grant M. Harding is like to fynd ſome good aduantage, as hauing vndoubtedly a great number of holy Fathers on his ſyde.* And Bucer acknowledgeth that, (10) *The Church of the Eaſt, Ægypt, and the Sea Apoſtolicke were accuſtomed in S. Hieromes tyme, not to take for Prieſtes, but either ſuch as were not maryed, or ceaſed to be, by abſtayning from their wyues.* The Councell of Nice, which Whitguift calleth, *that notable and famous Councell of Nice*, & which is of *all learned and wyſe men reuerenced, eſteemed, and imbraced next vnto the Scriptures themſelues*, did (as Cartwright acknowledgeth) teach that, (11) *Vnto thoſe that were choſen to the Miniſtry vnmarryed it was not lawfull to take any wyfe afterwardes &c.* And, Paphnutius sheweth, that not only this was before the Councell, but was an ancient Tradition of the Church, in which both

(5) *Apol. ad Pamach. c. 3.*

(6) *Ad. c. 11 ad Titum.*

(7) *L. 1. cont. Iouin. c. 14.*

(8) *Mat. 19. 29.*

(9) Defence of the Apology. p. 195.

(10) *Gratulatio ad Angl. p. 35.*

(11) In his ſecond Reply. part. 2. p. 483.

himselfe, and the rest of the Councell rested. So confessedly are the Ancient Councels & Fathers, against the Mariage of Priests.

SECT. IV.

That Protestants teach the Vow of Chastity to be righly annexed to holy Orders.

(1) The booke of the 6. Articles, set forth in the tyme of K. Henry the eight.
(2) Fulke against Heskins. p. 564. sec. 80. 82.
(3) *De Eccles. p. 150. 224. 226.*
(4) *Confes. Theol. part. 2. p. 158.*
(5) Harmony of Conf. & the obseruation therto annexed vpon the Confess. of Bohemia obseru. 4.
(6) *De Russorum &c Relig. pa. 117.*
(7) *In. 1. Cor. c. 7.*
(8) *Serm. de pace.*

THe allowance of wiues to the Clergy, is a Doctrine so pleasing and agreable to the Prot. Ministry, as that litle can be expected to be sayd by any of them agaynst the vse thereof. I find that the Church in (1) K. Henry the eight his tyme (which (2) Protestants acknowledge for a true Church) and also the now Waldenses do both of them maintaine, and defend the vnmarryed lyse of Priests: *the Waldenses* (sayth (3) Morgesterne) *do inforce their Ministers of the word to single lyse: They deny* (sayth (4) Melancthon) *marriage* to their Priests.

It is likewise confessed that, (5) *For the most part it is vsed in the Churches of Bohemia, that a single man should be taken into the Ecclesiasticall Ministery*; whereof also saith Lascitius, (6) *All the Ministers for the most part in Bohemia and Morauia do liue vnmarryed most holily.*

Iohn Husse teacheth that, (7) *Order is the seuenth impediment of Mariage, because a Clergy man in greater Orders, ought not to marry, because he hath made a vow.* Againe, (8) *Clergy men are greatly bound aboue the Common people to keep Chastity, both by reason of Diuine Precept, and by reason of their proper Vow, and by reason of the most holy Ministery, and by reason of the profitable Example.* All these reasons notwithstanding, I do not fynd amongst all the brood that are come from Luther, any one to allow the Vow of Chastity, to be annexed to the Clergy. Yet that which deserueth our obseruation is, that whereas throgh this whole booke I do confirme euery Point of our Catholike Doctrine, euen by the Testimonies and Grants of the learnedst Prot. themselues, yet in this of obliging the Clergy to a single Chastlyse, they especially heere of England do all

all forſake me. So pleaſant is Wedlocke to our fleſhly Miniſters.

SECT. V.

Obiections from Scriptures againſt the Vow of Chaſtity in Prieſts, anſwered.

MOſt Prot. do vrge that S. Paul foretelleth (1) *that in the laſt tymes certaine ſhall depart from the faith, attending to ſpirits of Error, and doctrines of Deuils &c. forbidding to marry &c.* Anſw. (2) S. Hierome, S. Auſtine, S. Ambroſe, and other Fathers, do vnderſtand this of thoſe who abſolutly forbid Mariage in all men, as being of its owne nature euill; of which ſort were Tacianus, Marcion, and Manichæus. *He forbiddeth* (ſayth S. Auſtine) (3) *to marry, who ſaith that it is euill, not he who preferreth before this good, another thing better.* Wheras Catholickes thinke Mariage to be a holy Sacrament, and compell none abſolutly to Continency, but only for iuſt reſpectes require that Condition in them, who of their owne accords deſire to take holy Orders: euen as the Church doth not prohibit temporall Iudges, or the office of a tormenter or Executioner, & yet thoſe Offices ſhe will not ſuffer Eccleſiaſticall men to execute. Some reply, that the foreſaid Heretickes are to come in the *laſt tymes*, & therfore it cannot be verifyed in Tatian, Marcion, & Manichæus: but by *Laſt tymes* is vnderſtood the laſt whole age, ſō Chriſt vntill the end of the world; for the Apoſtle ſpeaking of himſelfe, and others of his tyme ſayth, that vpon them (4) *the ends of the world are come*: and S. Iohn ſpeaking of his owne tyme, ſayth, (5) *Little Children it is the laſt houre:* And though amongſt the Manichees many did marry, yet (as (6) S. Auſtine teſtifyeth) this was not becauſe they thought it lawfull, but becauſe they would not be debarred therof.

Secondly it is obiected by M. Rogers, (7) that S. Paul requireth in a *Biſhop*, that *he be* (8) *the husband of one wyfe.* Anſwere. If this proueth any thing for Proteſtants, it proueth that euery Biſhop ought to haue a wyfe, and conſequent-

(1) 1. Tim. 4. 1. 2. 3.

(2) L. 1. *in Ioſuin. Aug. l. 30. cont. Fauſt. c. 4. 6. Ambr. & Chryſoſt. in hunc locum. Fulgent. de fide. c. 3.*

(3) *L. 30. cont. Fauſt. c. 6.*

(4) 1. Cor. 10. 10.

(5) 1. Ep. 2. 18.

(6) *L. 30. cont. Fauſt. c. 6.*

(7) Rogers Def. of the Art. art. 32. p. 180.

(8) 1. Tim. 3. 2.

ſequently if they haue not (as many of their owne Superintendants are wanting) they do not as Saint Paul preſcribeth. Beſides in the ſame verſe he teacheth , that a Biſhop muſt be chaſt, the true meaning then is, that he ought not to haue bene twice maried; euen as in the like phraſe, & in the ſame Epiſtle, he ſayth, (9) *Let a widdow be choſen &c. which hath bene the wyfe of one husband:* Wherby it is plaine, that the former place cannot be vnderſtood, as Caluin (10) and others would inforce, to wit, that S. Paul only counſaileth or commandeth , that a Biſhop ſhall not haue many wyues at once, for there was no reaſon that he ſhould command , that a Widow ſhould be choſen who had but one husband at once, ſeeing in no tyme or place was it euer vſed , that one woman at the ſame tyme ſhould be wyfe to many huſbands. Beſides in the tyme of S. Paul , it was not vſuall amongſt the Gentiles or Iewes, and much leſſe amongſt Chriſtians, for one man to haue many wyues at once, therfore needleſſe had it bene to haue prohibited holy Biſhops the ſame. As for the Gentiles in the Romane Empyre, wherwith the whole world was as then gouerned , Polygamy was infamous, and prohibited by many lawes , (11) which though they were enacted after the Apoſtles tyme , yet do they ſhew the prohibition therof, to haue bene much more Ancient. And as for the Iewes and Chriſtians , we ſee that when mention is made vpon any occaſion in the New Teſtament (12) of *wyfe*, the ſame is done in the ſingular number: and we may well thinke, that if as then it had bene lawfull, that Zachatias, and others who had their wyues barraine, would haue marryed others, which yet neither he, nor other priuat man did ; though K. Herod peraduenture and ſome other great Princes would ſometymes be careles therof. This vnderſtanding of this place, to wit, that he ſhould not be choſen Biſhop who had bene twice marryed is giuen by S. Auſtine, (13) S. Hierome, S. Ambroſe , and ſundry other Fathers .

But S. Chryſoſtome anſwereth directly to this place, ſaying, (14) *Paul the Apoſtle when he went to the Gentiles, did not impoſe vpon them the greateſt waight of vertue ; but willing to place Paſtors*

(9) 1. *Tim.* 5. 9.

(10) *In.* 1. *Tim. c.* 3. *& in c.* 1. *ad Tit. Cent.* 2. *l.* 2. *c.* 4. *Col.* 451.

(11) *ff. de bis qui notā. infam. l.* 1. *& c. de inceſt. nup. L. nemi. nem. & ad L. Iuliam. de Adult. L. Eum qui.*

(12) *Mat.* 5. 33. *&* 19. 3. 29. *Luc.* 14. 26. 1. *Cor.* 7. 2. 27. *Eph.* 5. 28. 31. 33.

(13) *Aug. l. de bono Coniug. c.* 18. *Hieron. in c.* 1. *ad Titum. Ambr. l.* 10. *ep.* 82. *Tertul. l.* 1. *ad vxorem. Epiphan. hær.* 59. *Chryſoſt. ho.* 2. *in Ep. ad Tit.*

(14) *Hom.* 2. *in Iob.*

Paſtors in the world which was replenished with Adulteries and fornications: and becauſe vertues were rarely found . ordaining Biſhops he ſaid to Titus. Ordaine (15) *Biſhopes, as I haue alſo appointed thee &c. the husband of one wyfe not ſo , that now this be obſerued in the Church . for a Prieſt ought to be adorned with all Chaſtity ; but becauſe that to thoſe who liued in fornication, it was a great thing. therfore he ſaid, Ordaine Biſhops &c. the husband of one wife . not that he made this a law, but that he pardoned their Error or infirmity.*

(15) *Tit. 1. 5.*

Thirdly it is obiected that, (16) *Marriage is honourable in all.* Ergo in Prieſts. Anſwer. By the like reaſon might be proued, that marriages of kinſfolkes in the firſt and ſecond degree, and of Children without conſent of their Parents, is honourable and lawfull, which yet Caluin denyeth. The meaning therfore is, that it is honourable in all lawfully ioined togeather, whether they be old or yong, noble or baſe, Greekes or Hebrewes &c. And thus is it expounded by (17) Theophilact. Alſo it is honourable in all things which belong to Marriage, as in that it is a Sacrament, in that therby they mutually giue their faith , in regard of their yſſue.

(16) *Inſtit. l. 4 c. 19. §. 27.* Rogers Def. of the Art. art. 32. p. 388.

(17) *In hunc locum.*

Laſtly, this place maketh as much againſt thoſe who haue the guift of Continency, as againſt Prieſts, ſeeing ſuch, according to Proteſtants, are bound to contayne. But S. Auſtines anſwer will peraduenture better ſatisfy, who ſayth, (18) *But perhaps it wilbe ſayd , if it be lawfull and good to marry , why it is not lawfull for Prieſts to haue wyues?* To this he preſently anſwereth, *who knoweth not that euery thing hath its order ; for there is ſomething which is not altogeather generally lawfull, to all , and there is ſomething which is lawfull to ſome, and not to others: and which is ſometymes lawfull , and ſometymes not . It is neuer lawfull for any man to commit fornication ; but it is lawfull to bargayne ſometymes and ſometimes not ; for before a man be of the Clergy, he may lawfully bargaine , but after not. It is lawfull ſometymes for a Chriſtian to company with his wife , ſometymes not . Vpon dayes of Proceſſion ſometimes it is not lawfull , becauſe abſtinence muſt be euen from lawfull things , that what is deſired may more eaſily be obtayned &c. Is euery thing lawfull before an Emperor, which is lawfull before others? how much more in matters concerning God? Hereby it is , that the Biſhop ought to be purer then others , for he ſeeeth*

(18) *Quæſtionibus Vet. ac. Nou. Teſt. q. 127. fin.*

meth to beare his perſon, for he is his Vicar, that what is lawfull for others, may not be lawfull for him; becauſe he muſt daily ſupply the place of Chriſt, either praying for the people, or offering, or baptizing. And generation is not only vnlawfull to him, but alſo to his Miniſtery, becauſe he ought to be purer, ſeeing the thinges which he miniſtreth are holy. So plainely is this Obiection anſwered by S. Auſtine.

(19) Rogers Def. of the Art. art. 31. p. 186.

(20) 1. Cor. 9. 5.

(21) Philip. 4. 3.

(22) L. 1. cont. Iouin. c. 14.

Fourthly, is (19) obiected that the Apoſtles themſelues had wyues, and that they carryed them about with them when they peached, (20) *Haue we not power* (ſayth S. Paul) *to lead about a woman a Siſter, as alſo the reſt of the Apoſtles? &c.* And, (21) *I beſeech thee my ſincere companion*: in both which places Prot. dreame of wyues. Anſw. But I will refer them to (22) S. Hierome, anſwering herein their forefather Iouinian in theſe wordes: *Peter, and the reſt of the Apoſtles, that I may grant him for the preſent, out of our abundance, had wyues; but ſuch as they tooke when they knew not the Goſpel: who afterwards taken to be Apoſtles, they relinquish the Office of Marriage. For when Peter in the perſon of the Apoſtles, ſayd to our Lord, Behould we haue left all, and followed thee? Our Lord anſwereth him: Amen, I ſay to you, that there is no man who ſhall leaue houſe, or Parents, or Brethren, or wyfe, for the kingdome of heauen, who ſhall not receiue much more in this world, & in the world to come life euerlaſting. But if he ſhall obiect that vnto vs (as* Prot. do) *to proue that all the Apoſtles had wiues, Haue we not power to carry about women or wyues (becauſe vxor with the Grecians ſignifyeth both) as the reſt of the Apoſtles and Peter? let him ioyne that which is in the Greeke bookes, Haue we not power to carry about ſiſters, women, or wyues? Whereby it appeareth that he ſpeaketh of other holy women, who according to the cuſtome of the Iewes, did miniſter to their Maiſters of their owne ſubſtance, as we read, they did to our Lord himſelf. And the order of the words doth ſignify this, Haue we not power to eate and drinke; or to carry about ſiſters women? where &c. it is plaine, wyues ought not to be vnderſtood &c. or if we will by γυναικας, vnderſtand wyues, not women, that which is added, ſiſters, taketh away wyues, and sheweth that they were allied in ſpirit, not wyues. Although, excepting Peter the Apoſtle, it is not plainly recorded of the other Apoſtles that they had wyues. And ſeeing it is written of one, and nothing ſayd of the other, we ought to vnderſtand*

derſtand that they were without wyues, of whome the Scripture ſigni-
fieth no ſuch thing. Thus far S. Hierome.

Adde yet heerunto, that in the word γυναικα (21 (23) S. Auſtine noteth) according as the Apoſtle hath put it down with all circumſtances, there it no ambiguity, for that Saint Paul had no wife, himſelfe witneſſeth, ſaying. (24) *I ſay to the vnmarryed and widdowes, it is good for them if they ſo abyde, euen as I alſo; but if they do not containe, let them marry.* And the ſame is the conſent of (25) Antiquity. Beſides the word γυναικα of it ſelfe, (as (26) Beza confeſſeth) doth rather ſignify a *woman*, then a *wyfe*, and therefore he reprehendeth Eraſmus for tranſlating, *It is good for a man not to touch a wyfe, becauſe* (ſayth Beza) *there is no circumſtance annexed, why it ſhould ſo ſignify*; Wherefore much more when the circumſtance (as S. Auſtine ſayth) maketh it certaine, that ſo it doth not ſignify. But let vs heare S. Auſtines owne words, (27) *Faithfull women hauing earthly ſubſtance, went with them, and miniſtred of their goods, that they might not be in need of any thing which belongeth to the neceſſities of this life; which bleſſed Paul ſheweth was lawfull to him, euen as the other Apoſtles did; but afterwards he reſuſeth that he would not vſe that power. Some not vnderſtanding this* (let our Proteſtant Tranſlatours and Interpreters attend) *do interpret not a woman a Siſter, but a wyfe, whereas he ſayd,* (28) *Haue not we power to carry about a woman a Siſter*; The ambiguity of the Greeke word γυνὴ deceiued them, in that, *wyfe* and *woman* by the ſame word in greeke is ſignified, although the Apoſtle hath ſo placed it, that they ought not to haue beene deceiued: for he neither ſpeaketh only of a woman, but a woman Siſter, not of marrying, but of carrying about. But this ambiguity hath not deceyued other Interpreters, expounding a woman, not a wyfe:* ſo particularly doth S. Auſtine ſatisfy this common Obiection.

Laſtly, note, that whereas amongſt all the Fathers, only (29) Clemens Alexandrinus vnderſtandeth the forſaid places of *wyues*, yet he addeth, that the Apoſtles liued not with them, as with wyues in the ſtate of Marriage: yea (30) Euſebius thinketh, that he wrote the ſame κατὰ συνήθειαν, by way of Contention or diſputation, whileſt he wrot againſt them that impugned marriage: ſo that in the true ſenſe, it is

(23) *De opere Monachorum. c. 4.*
(24) 1. Cor. 7. 8.
(25) *Chryſoſt. de virgin. c. 14. Hieron. Ep. 22. ad Euſtoch. c. 8. Hilar. in Pſal. 127. Aug. l. de Gra. & lib. Arb. c. 4. cir. med. Epiſt. 157. Valeſiorum; Ambro. in 1. Cor. c. 7. Tertul. l. ad vxorem. Chryſoſt. & Theodor. in c. 4. ad Philip.*
(26) *Annot. in Mat. 5. 28. & 1. Cor. 7. 2.*
(27) *Lib. de opere Monachorum. c. 4.*
(28) 1. Cor. 9. 5.
(29) *Lib. 3. Strom.*
(30) *Lib. 2. c. 24.*

ſpoken of holy women, who followed the Apoſtles, and miniſtred vnto them of their goods.

In like ſort, whereas in the later place, Proteſtants trãſlate for a *faithfull Companion*, *a faithfull yoak-fellow*, that therby cannot be vnderſtood S. Paules wife, beſides what hath beene ſayd it is playne, in that *faithfull, germane*, γνήσιε, is the Maſculine gender, and ſo tranſlated by Caluin and Beza: thereby therfore is meant, ſome man who was fellow with S. Paul in preaching of the Goſpell. Laſtly, it is ſo certayne, that S. Paul was not marryed, that Caluin commenting vpon theſe words, *I ſay to the vnmarryed and Widdowes, it is good for them, if they ſo abyde, euen as I alſo*, affirmeth thus plainly, (31) *This place ſheweth the Apoſtle then to haue bene ſingle. For whereas Eraſmus argueth that he was marryed, becauſe amongſt marryed men he maketh mention of himſelfe, it is tryfling and weake, becauſe it might by the ſame reaſon be gathered, that he was a widdower, becauſe amongſt widdowers he ſpeaketh of himſelfe. But the wordes ſound, that then he was not marryed. Neither do I admit that Coniecture, that he left his wife ſomewhere, and of his owne accord debarred himſelfe of the vſe of the Marriage-bed.* So tryfling and weake are theſe Obiections, and ſo cleerly anſwered by Scriptures, Fathers, and Proteſtants.

(31) *In 1. Cor. 7. 8.*

CHAP.

CHAP. XIV.

The true State of the Queſtion, Concerning Chriſt his deſcending into Hell.

Whether Chriſt our Sauiour truly deſcended in ſoule into Hell; And there redeemed thoſe who were in Abrahams boſome, or Limbus; Or that by Hell, ſhould only be vnderſtood his Graue; Or his ſuffering, the paynes of Hell.

SECT. I.

Catholike Doctrine.

WHAT the Church of Chriſt belieueth concerning this Article of our faith, will cleerly appeare by her holy Decrees, amongſt which that of the ancient Councell of Ariminum was this, (1) *We belieue the ſonne of God according to the will of his Father, to haue bene Crucifyed and dyed, and to haue deſcended to hell, and there to haue performed what belonged to his charge, whom the Porters of Hell beholding were afraid, and that the third day he roſe from hell, and conuerſed with his Diſciples.* The Councell of Toledo further defyneth, that, (2) *He deſcended to hell, that he might take out from thence the Saintes that there were kept, and the power of death ouercome, he riſe agayne.*

(1) *Apud Athanaſium de Synodo Ariminn.*

(2) *Conc. Toletan. 4. c. 1.*

gaine. *This is the faith of the Catholicke Church, this Confession we keep and hould.* According to the Councell of Laterane, (3) *The only begotten sonne of God &c. suffered vpon the wood of the Crosse and dyed, he descended to hel, &c. But he descended in Soule, he rose in flesh, ascended alike in both.* And it is the constant faith of all (4) Catholickes, that Christ in soule truly descended into hell, and deliuered the holy Fathers that were in Limbus, or Abrahams bosome; and that by Hell is not vnderstood his graue, or his suffering any paines of Hell, which were most impious to imagine; but a place vnder the groũd, where the said Fathers were reserued vntill Christes Comming.

(1) Cap. 2.

(4) *Bellar. de Christi anima. l. 4. c. 12. &c. Rhem. Test. in Luc. 16, 22. & in 1. Pet. 3, 19.*

Pointes Disputable.

Some (5) teach that Christ descended by reall presence only to *Limbus Patrum*, and by effect to all places of hell. Others (6) thinke that his soule truly descended to all places of Hell.

Some (7) affirme, the dolours of death to haue continued with Christ vntill his resurrection, by reason of the penalties, which by death were left, as the separation of the soule, the being therof in a place vnworthy of it, and the being of the body in the Graue. Others (8) better teach, that Christes soule, whileſt it was in hell, was without all paine, the same ceasing with his death. Some (9) teach that Christ descending, deliuered only such soules out of Purgatory, as had made due satisfaction, or that had peculiar Deuotion to the future Passion of Christ. Others (10) affirme that he deliuered from paine all the iust and Elect of God, and consequently those that were in Purgatory.

(5) S. Tho. 3. *part. q. 52. art. 2.*
(6) *Bellar. de Christo. l. 4. c. 16.*
(7) *Caiet. in Act c. 2. S. Tho. 3 part. q. 52. art. 2.*
(8) *Bonau. 3. Dist. 22. q. 4.*
(9) *S. Tho. 3. p. q. 52. art. 8.*
(10) *S. Bonau. 3. Dist. 22. q. 5. Tho. Argent. eadem. Dist. q. vnica art. 4. Gab. eadem Dist. q. vnica art. 3. dub. 3.*

Protestant Doctrine.

Protestants in this Article of faith are much deuided amongst themselues. For some (11) teach, that Christ only descended to his *graue*, and that by *hell* is vnderstood his *Graue*. Others by *Hell* vnderstand, that he *suffered the paines of*

(11) *Bucer in c. 27. Mat. Beza in 2. Act.*

the Damned. thus Caluin: (12) Teaching further, that to vſe his words, *This fable of Limbus Patrum, for the deliuery of whom they ſay Chriſt deſcended, although it haue great authors, yet it is nothing but a fable.* Whitakers faith concerning this Article of our Creed is this, (13) *I do beleiue that the ſoule of Chriſt looſed from the body, not only not to haue deſcended to Hell, but forthwith to haue bene taken into heauen.* And the like is taught by ſundry other Prot. (14) ſome wherof (15) do plainly ſay, that *this ſentence, or* (Article) *is to be taken out of the Creed.* D. Hill a Prot. wrote a booke in defence of this Article according to our Catholicke vnderſtanding therof, in which he citeth for his opinion Aretius, Apinus, M. Nowel, and Melanchton. M. Carlile wrote another booke directly to the contrary, cyting ſundry Prot. in his behalfe. So that the Reformed Church is yet to determine what is to be beliued concerning this Article.

(12) *Inſtit. l. 2. c. 16. §. 9. & ad c. 30. Iob. & in Catech. edit. 1562.*

(13) *Cont. Dur. l. 9. ſec. 27.*

(14) Perkins in his Expoſition of the Creed. To. 1. Col. 678. Polanus in Diſput. periodo 2. diſp. 23.

(15) *Apud Aret. in loc. part. 2. fol. 72.*

Proteſtants agree with Ancient Heretickes.

Origen (16) taught that Hell was nothing but the horrour of Conſcience. And the ſame is taught by (17) Caluin.

(16) *Hiſtor. Ep. ad Auitum.*

(17) *Inſt. l. 3. c. vlt.*

Proteſtant Errours.

Brentius (18) vnderſtandeth, by deſcending into hell, to be vtterly *Deſtroyed*. Caluin, (19) that Chriſt ſuffered the paines of the damned ſoules. And others proteſſe, that, (20) *they ſimply beleiue, that the whole perſon God and Man after Buriall deſcended into Hell.* But if Chriſt Man deſcended into Hell, then he deſcended alyue not dead, for he that is dead is not man, ſeeing euery man by death ceaſeth to be man. And if a liuing man he deſcended, then not only his ſoule, but likewiſe his fleſh deſcended, for the ſoule alone cannot be ſaid to be man. Now if the ſoule and fleſh deſcended, what remained in the Graue?

(18) *In Catechiſmo Anni 1551.*

(19) *Inſt. l. 2. c. 16. §. 8. 9. 10. 11. & in Harmon. Euang. ad c. 27. Matth.*

(20) *L. Concordiæ. p. 750.*

M. Rogers acknowledgeth certaine Prot. to teach, that, (21) *Chriſt alyue vpon the Croſſe humbled himſelfe vſque ad Inferni tremenda*

(21) Def. of the Art. art. 5. p. 16.

tremenda tormenta, euen vnto the dreadfull torments of Hell: endured for a tyme those torments which the Reprobate shall euerlastingly suffer in hell: euen despayred of Gods mercy, fynding God at this tyme, non Patrem sed Tyrannum, not a Father, but a Tyrant: and ouercame despayre by despayre, death by death, hell by hell, and Sathan by Sathan: suffered actually all the torments of Hell for our Redemption: & descended into the heauiest torments that Hell could yield: suffered the torments of Hell, the second death, Abiection from God, and was made a Curse, that is, had the bitter anguish of Gods wrath in his soule and body, which is the fyre that shall neuer be quenched. And in like sort, Parkes affirmeth, that, (22) *Luther, Illyricus, Latimer, did teach Christ to haue descended into hell in soule and body, and there suffered torments after Death.* But these Blasphemies are to be abhorred, and yet they are vttered by Luther, Caluin, and other principall Protestants.

Neither do they stay here, but euen proceed to the taking away both of *Heauen* and *Hell*, and to sundry other such Errors tending to Atheisme. Luther sayth, (23) *I cannot affirme whether the soules of the wicked be tormented presently after death. I am* (24) *not very certaine what Hell is before the last day.* Schultetus, (25) *That assertion of his as it is new, so false; the soules to suffer in hell before the bodyes.* Schlusselburge, (26) *The Catechisme of the Heidelbergians, maketh it doubtfull, whether indeed there be any Hell, and place ordayned, in which the wicked and the damned after this lyfe, togeather with the Deuils, must be afflicted with Eternall punishments.* (27) Brentius, *I laugh at your Old wiues fooleryes, of that your corporall and locall Heauen and Hell.* (28) *Locall Hell is faigned.* Perkins, (29) *We must not faigne Hell to be some certaine determined & corporall place.* Caluin, (30) *It is childish to inclose soules in the Prison of the Dead.* And, (31) *Concerning fyre eternall we may gather, that it is a Metaphoricall speach.* Danæus, (32) *It is a thing impossible that the soules of men, separated from their bodies, can be tormented and afflicted with any Corporall fyre.* (33) *That the sacred Scripture treating of the Punishment of damned men, euen in their soules, doth call it fyre, those speaches are not naturall, but Metaphoricall, neither there is it treated of materiall fyre.* Perkins, (34) *We must not faigne the Torments* (of Hell) *to be corporall, but rather spirituall, seeing it is the apprehension of Gods*

(22) Against Willet p. 214.
(23) Tom. 6. in Gen. c. 25. fol. 321.
(24) Tom. 4. in c. 2. Ionæ. fol. 418.
(25) Medul. in Tertul. part. 1 c. 42.
(26) Theol. Caluinist. lib. 2, art. 27. fol. 145.
(27) Apud Hospin. part. 2. Hist. anno 1562. fol. 308.
(28) Ib p. 331.
(29) Tom. 2. in Apoc. 2. Col. 90.
(30) Instit. l. 2 c. 16. §. 9.
(31) In Mat. 3. 12. & in Mat. 25. 30. & in c. 30. Isaiæ.
(32) Controu. 6. p. 1181.
(33) Ibid.
(34) Tom. 2. in Apoc. 2. Col. 90. Vorstius in Anisbel. p. 269. Tolosus in syntag. c. 68 Lobech. disput. 6. f. 133. & Disp. 19. p. 439. Pola-

Gods wrath and reuenge. B. D. Bilſon confeſſeth that, (35) *S. Auſtine long ſince hath plainly reſolued, that the fyre of Hell is not only a true fyre, but a corporall fyre, that ſhall punish both men and Deuils.* Yea S. Hierome condemneth Origen, for teaching that, (36) *The fyre of Hell &c. doth not torment, but the Conſcience of ſinners.* And it is vndoubted, that theſe broachers of ſuch impious Doctrines do preſently after their deathes ſee and feele their errors, fynding a locall Hell, and corporall Fyre, tormenting their ſoules for all Eternity.

(35) In his Suruey p. 44.

(36) *Ad Auitum.* And ſee Bilſons Suruey. p. 51.

SECT. II.

It is proued by Scriptures, that Chriſt our Sauiour truly deſcended in ſoule into Hell; And there redeemed thoſe who were in Abrahams boſome, or Limbus.

THE truth of this Article of our Creed is proued by ſuch Scriptures as teach, that Chriſt was the firſt that aſcended into heauen: for hence it followeth, that the ſoules of the iuſt departed before his tyme, were detayned ſomewhere els. To this purpoſe ſayth S. Paul, (1) *Now Chriſt is riſen againe from the dead, the firſt fruites of them that ſleepe.* And in this reſpect Chriſt is called, (2) *the firſt borne of the dead:* And we are further taught, that, (3) *The law brought nothing to Perfection, but an Introduction of a better hope.* And therfore that, (4) *the way of holyes* (by which is meant (5) *heauen*) *was not yet manifeſted, the former Tabernacle* (by which is vnderſtood the (6) *Old Teſtament*) *as yet ſtanding.* And this *way of holyes* is called, (7) *A new and liuing way, which* (Chriſt) *hath dedicated* (or begunne, ἐνεκαίνισεν) *to vs.* And in reguard hereof the Fathers of the Old Teſtament, are ſaid to haue (8) *dyed according to faith, not hauing receiued the Promiſes:* (9) *God for vs prouiding ſome better thing, that they without vs ſhould not be Conſummate.* All theſe Textes ſhew, that the way to Heauen was not opened before Chriſtes Reſurrection, and that himſelfe was the firſt that did dedicate, or beginne this way vnto vs.

(1) 1. Cor. 15. 20.
(2) Col. 1. 18. Ap. 1. 5.
(3) Heb. 7. 19.
(4) Heb. 9. 8.
(5) Heb. 9. 24 & 10. 19.
(6) Heb. 9. 1, 2.
(7) Heb. 10. 19.
(8) Heb. 11. 13.
(9) Heb. 11. 40.

The

The ſame truth is confirmed by ſuch places, as ſhow that the forſaid ſoules of the iuſt before Chriſtes Comming were in hell. Iacob bewayling his ſonne Ioſephs ſuppoſed death, ſaith, (10) *I will deſcend to my ſonne in Hell.* Iacob & Ioſeph were both iuſt, and yet here it is ſaid, that they deſcended into Hell. Dines being in Hell, *ſaw Abraham* (11) *a far off, and Lazarus in his boſome:* which argueth that both ſoules were in the ſame gulfe, though far diſtant amongſt themſelues. Neither will it ſuffice to anſwere that, this of Lazarus is only a Parable, and therfore not ſtrong in proofe: for in the Iudgments of S. Ambroſe, (12) S. Hierome, S. Auſtine, and S. Gregory (the 4. great Doctours of the Catholicke Church) it is a true Hiſtory, their proper names being ſet downe. And though it were a Parable, yet it maketh fully for the preſent purpoſe, as euery Circumſtance therof doth cleerly ſhew.

(10) Gen. 37. 35.

(11) Luc. 16. 23.

(12) In c. 16. Luc. Hier. l. 2. in Iouin. Aug. de cura pro mort c. 14. Greg. l. 4. Dial. c. 29.

In like ſort that it was Samuels ſoule that aſcended from the Earth, and appeared to Saul, it is playne by theſe wordes, (13) *When the woman had ſeene Samuel, ſhe cryed out with a loud voyce* &c. *And Saul vnderſtood that it was Samuel,* &c. *And Samuel ſaid to Saul, why haſt thou diſquieted me, that I ſhould be rayſed vp?* And it is placed among the prayſes of Samuel, that, (14) *After this he ſlept, and he notified to the king, and ſhewed him the end of his lyfe, and he exalted his voyce out of the Earth in Prophecy* &c. This place ſheweth that Samuels *Soule* was rayſed out of the Earth. Neither was the *Soule* of ſo great a Prophet ſubiect to the enchantment of a Witch, but preuented the ſame, wherat the *woman* (15) *was much troubled.*

(13) 1. Reg. 28. 11.

(14) Eccl. 46. 23.

(15) 1. Reg. 28. 12. 13.

The ſame is confirmed by ſuch Textes as ſhow, that Chriſt deliuered the Captiue out of Priſon, ſo the Prophet Zachary ſayth, (16) *Thou alſo in the bloud of the Teſtament, haſt ſent forth thy Priſoners out of the lake, wherin is no water.* This to be ſpoken of Chriſt, is euident by the (17) precedent verſes: And S. Peter ſaith of Chriſt, *In* (18) *the which ſpirit comming he preached to them alſo that were in Priſon,* which all vnderſtand of the Priſon of Hell.

(16) Zach 9. 11.

(17) 9. 10.

(18) 1. Pet. 3. 19.

All ſuch places proue the ſame, as teach, that before the Aſcenſion of Chriſt, the ſoules of ſundry dead perſons returned,

ned, and were reunited agayne to their bodies: whereof we may find examples of (19) *Lazarus*, the (20) *Mayde*, & of (21) *many bodies* of the Saints that had ſlept (and) roſe. Now that theſe returned from heauen, or the Hell of the damned, none do imagine.

(19) Io. 11. 43.
(20) Luc. 8. 55.
(21) Mat. 27. 52.

This alſo is yet further conuinced by all ſuch places as teach, that Chriſt himſelfe was in Hell, or the lower parts of the Earth, (22) *As Ionas was in the whales belly, three dayes & three nights: ſo ſhall the ſonne of man be in the hart of the Earth 3. daies, and 3. nights.* Now by the *hart of the Earth* is vnderſtood *Hell*, which is in the depth of the Earth, as the hart is in the depth of a body: whereas the *Graue* is in the ſuperficies of the Earth, and Chriſts ſepulcher was peraduenture aboue the Earth: beſides in the ſepulcher was only Chriſts dead body, whereas Ionas was aliue in the body of the whale. In like ſort it is ſayd, (23) *Thou wilt not leaue my ſoule in Hell*; this being plainely ſpoken of Chriſt, is ſo conuincing that Beza to auoid the ſame, doth tranſlate moſt abſurdly, *Thou ſhalt not leaue my carcaſe in the Graue*, or, *my ſoule in the Graue*, as ſhall be ſhewed next heerafter.

(22) Mat. 12. 40.
(23) Act. 2. 27.

S. Pauls words alſo are moſt pregnāt (24) *Aſcending on high, he led Captiuity captiue &c. And that he aſcended, what it is, but becauſe he deſcēded alſo firſt, into the inferiour parts of the Earth.* Theſe words litterally taken, do conuince Chriſt to haue deſcēded into Hell, & to haue deliuered the iuſt that were Captiues.

(24) Eph. 4. 8.

But now to obſerue how Prot. corrupt the Texts of Scripture in fauour of their hereſy: becauſe theſe wordes, (25) *Thou wilt not leaue my ſoule in hell*, do proue Chriſts ſoule to haue deſcended to hell, Beza in his (26) Tranſlation chāgeth it thus, *Thou will not leaue my carcaſe in the Graue*; which he defendeth in theſe words, (27) *My ſoule, in the Text, I Interpreted, my Carcaſe, but in the Annotation, my Lyfe. And we may take my ſoule, inſteed of the Pronowne (me)* which expoſitiō is moſt ſimple. And wheras he addeth, *he obſerueth Errour to haue riſen by the Old Tranſlation, animam meam, my ſoule, he ſayth, I did it not rashly, ſeeing we ſee this place principally to be wreſted by the Papiſts, for the eſtabliſhing of their Limbus, and the Ancient (Fathers) alſo from thence haue found out that deſcending of Chriſts ſoule into hell.* In

(25) Act. 2. 27.
(26) Anno 1557.
(27) Add defenſ. Caſtal. p. 460.

like ſort where it is ſayd, (28) *forſeeing he ſpake of the Reſurrection of Chriſt, for neither was he left in hell*; the (29) Prot. of Geneua, in their Bibles inſteed of *Hell*, do make *Graue*. And (30) Tremelius followeth them therein in his latin Bible. And the like corruption is frequently (31) to be found in our Engliſh Tranſlations. In like ſort, where S. Paul ſaith, that (32) *Chriſt hath dedicated to vs a new and liuing way*, to wit, the way into Heauē, (33) Prot. tranſlate, *he prepared*: whereas the Greeke word, ἐνεκαίνισεν, *intrauit*, ſignifyeth to make new, to beginne a thing, to dedicate.

(28) *Act.* 2. 31.
(29) *Anno* 1562. 1567. 1568. 1605.
(30) *Anno* 1603.
(31) See the Engl. Bib. of 1578. Oſe. 13. 14. Pſ. 85. 13. Gen. 17. 15.
(32) *Heb.* 10. 20.
(33) Eng. Bib. of 1578. Fulk. in Heb. 10. 20.

SECT. III.

That the Anciet Fathers do agreably expound the Scriptures in proofe of Chriſts deſcending into Hell, and his deliuering of the iuſt in Captiuity.

SAint Irenæus expoundeth many Texts of Scripture for Chriſts deſcending into Hell, ſaying, (1) *During the 3. dayes he conuerſed where the Dead were*, (2) *as the Prophecy ſayth of him, he remembred his Holy Ones that were dead, thoſe that before ſlept in the land of Promiſe, he deſcended to them to fetch them out, and ſaue them. And our Lord himſelfe*, (3) *As Ionas was in the Whales belly &c. The Apoſtle alſo*, (4) *He aſcended, what is it, but becauſe he deſcended firſt into the inferiour parts of the Earth. Dauid alſo prophecying of him, ſayth*, (5) *Thou haſt deliuered my ſoule from the lower Hell*: ſo fully S. Irenæus.

(1) *L. 5 fine.*
(2) *Ionas.* 2. 2.
(3) *Mat.* 12. 40.
(4) *Eph.* 4. 9.
(5) Pſ. 86. 13.

Origen teacheth that, (6) *Towards the end of the world, the only begotten ſonne for the ſaluation of the world, deſcended euen to hell, and from thence recalled* (Adam) *the firſt framed: for that which he ſayd to the Theefe*, (7) *This day thou ſhalt be with me in Paradiſe, do not vnderſtand as ſayd to him alone, but alſo to all the Holy Ones, for whome he deſcended to hell.*

(6) *Ho. 15. in Gen.*
(7) *Luc.* 23.

S. Baſil (8) vpon theſe words, *God will redeeme my ſoule out of the hand of Hell*, affirmeth that, *he plainly propheſieth the deſcending of Chriſt to Hell, who was to deliuer together with others the ſoule of the Prophet himſelfe, that he ſhould not remayne there.*

(8) *Ho. in Pſ.* 48. 16.

S.

S. Chryſoſtome auoucheth that, (9) *Chriſt the ſunne of Iuſtice this day aſcended, hauing preached to the ſoules of the Iuſt, lifting vp with him from Hell their bodies, as it were the Quyres of ſpirituall ſtarres. Hieruſalem ſhyned, wherein thoſe who roſe are ſeene &c. And it is truly called the day of light, in which the darknes of blyndnes fell away; they ſhouted out* (10) *who were in darknes, becauſe they ſaw great light, and to thoſe who dwelt in the Country of the ſhaddow of death, light is riſen.* Agayne, alledging theſe plaineſt wordes of the Prophet Iſay, (11) *I will breake the braſen gates, & will burſt the iron barres,* And, *I will giue the hidden treaſures &c.* he ſayth, (12) *Thus he calleth Hell, for though it were Hell, yet is kept the holy ſoules and precious veſſels, Abraham, Iſac, and Iacob: for which cauſe he calleth them treaſures, but hidden ones, becauſe as yet the ſunne of Iuſtice hath not ſhined there.*

(9) *Ser. 5. de reſurrect.*
(10) *Iſa. 9. 2.*
(11) *C. 45. 2.*
(12) *Demonſtrat. aduerſ. Gentiles, quod Chriſtus fuit Deus.*

Laſtly, (13) *Before the comming of the Sauiour, before Chriſt with the Theefe opened the gates of Paradiſe, all the ſoules of the iuſt were carryed to Hell. Finally, Iacob ſayth,* (14) *Mourning and groaning I will deſcend to Hell; Therefore our Lord dyed, therefore he deſcended to Hell, that the ſoules which were there bound, might be looſed.* What more plaine for Chriſtes deſcending into Hell?

(13) *Ho. 4. in Mar.*
(14) *Gen. 37. 35.*

And yet in no leſſe plaine termes ſpeaketh S. Hierome, (15) *Iacob bewailed his ſonne whom he thought was ſlaine, to whom himſelfe alſo was about to deſcend into Hell,* ſaying, (16) *Mourning I will deſcend to my ſonne in Hell; becauſe Chriſt as yet had not broken open the gate of Paradiſe; as yet his bloud had not quenched the fiery ſword &c. of the Cherubims that had charge: Wherupon Abraham alſo, though he was in a place of reſt, yet it is written,* (17) *that he was with Lazarus in Hell.* Againe, (18) *Before the Comming of Chriſt, all thinges were caryed togeather to Hell, wherupon Iacob ſaid, that he was to deſcend to Hell. And Iob complained that both the Godly, and the wicked were detayned in Hell. And the Ghoſpell teſtifyeth, that there is a great Chaos in Hell, placed betwene, and that Abraham is with Lazarus, and that the rich man is in punishment. And indeed before Chriſt with the Theefe had at the gates of Paradiſe layd open the flaming wheele, and burning ſword, the beames were ſhut.* So manifeſt it is, that before Chriſtes comming none aſcended into heauen.

(15) *Ep. 25. c. 3.*
(16) *Gen. 37. 35.*
(17) *Luc. 16. 23.*
(18) *Ad c. 3. Eccleſiaſtici.*

But no man explayneth the Scriptures more plainly in this behalfe then S. Auſtine, who alleadging theſe wordes of our Sauiour, *This day ſhalt thou be with me in Paradiſe*, affirmeth that, (19) *Chriſt Ieſus Man was not to be that day in heauen, but according to his ſoule in Hell and according to his fleſh in the graue: and of the fleſh, that it was layd that day in the graue, the Ghoſpell is moſt manifeſt. And that the ſoule deſcended into Hell, the Apoſtolicall Doctrine teacheth,* (20) *Becauſe thou wilt not leaue my ſoule in Hell, nor giue thy Holy One to ſee corruption.* Againe, (21) *that our Lord dead in fleſh, came to Hell, it is playne inough, for the Prophecy cannot be gainſaid which ſayth, Becauſe thou wilt not leaue my ſoule in hell, which leaſt any ſhould preſume to vnderſtand otherwiſe, Peter expounded the ſame in the Actes of the Apoſtles, euen in thoſe his wordes in which he affirmeth, that,* (22) *he looſed the ſorrowes of Hell, according as it was impoſſible that he ſhould be holden of it. Who therfore but an Infidell, will deny that Chriſt was in hell &c. That according to his ſoule he was in hell, the Scripture plainly declareth &c.* And in another place (23) *Our Lord was not yet come to Hell, that he might deliuer from thence the ſoules of all the Iuſt that went before him, & yet Abraham was in reſt; and Dines tormented in Hell, when he ſaw Abraham, he liſted vp his eyes, for he could not ſee him with eyes hifted vp, vnleſſe Abraham were aboue, and himſelfe below.* This was ſo cleerly his Doctrine, that (24) D. Bilſon and Aretius do alleadge S. Auſtine for Chriſtes deſcending into Hell. So that in S. Auſtines iudgment they are *Infidels*, who deny this Article of our faith, *He deſcended into Hell.*

That it was truly the ſoule of Samuel that was rayſed vp, and appeared vnto K. Saul, it is conſtantly taught by S. Auſtine, (25) S. Ambroſe, S. Baſil, and S. Hieromie.

Laſtly S. Thaddæus, one of Chriſtes Diſciples in his Doctrine publiſhed by Euſebius, and by him (26) *Collected from Ancient Chronicles, and publick tables thereof reſerued in the City of Edeſſa*, where the ſaid Doctrine was by Thaddæus deliuered, ſayth of our Sauiour, (27) *He deſcended into Hell, and broke in ſunder the wall, which during the worlds ſpace remayned whole and vnmoued. After he roſe the third day, he rayſed the dead, who had ſlept for many yeares; and although he deſcended alone, yet he aſcended to his Father with great multitude.* This was ſo certainly the

(19) *Ep. 57. ad Dard.*

(20) *Act. 2. 27.*

(21) *Ep. 99. ad Euod.*

(22) *Act. 2. 24.*

(23) *In Pſal. 85.* And ſee *Tract. 111. in Ioan.*

(24) Survey of Chriſtes ſuffer. p. 626. 598. 599. Aret. loc. com p. 53.

(25) *De cura pro mort. c. 13. Ambr. in Luc. 1. Baſ. Ep. 80. Hier. in Iſa. 7.*

(26) *Euſeb. Hiſt l. 1. c. vlt.*

(27) *Ibid. fin.*

the saying of S. Thaddæus, that Frigiuillens Gaunius a Prot. maketh mention herof from Eusebius, and concludeth that, (28) *Those things which Eusebius deliuereth of the Preaching of Thaddæus at Edessa, and the Conuersion of Agbarus to Christ, no man of mature Iudgment will impugne.* And D. Hill alleadgeth sundry times this Testimony and saying of Thaddæus in his booke of the Defence of the Article, *that Christ descended into Hell.*

(28) Pabna Christiana p. 74.

This the Fathers so plainely taught, that M. Iacob confesseth that, (29) *All the Fathers with one consent do affirme, that Christ deliuered the soules of the Patriarches and Prophets out of Hell at his coming thither, and so spoyled Sathan of those that were then in his present possession.* D. Barlow sayth, (30) *This passeth most vyse among the Fathers, who taking Inferi, for Abrahams bosome, expound it that Christ went thither, ad liberandum liberandos, to conuey the fathers deceased before his Resurrection, into the place where now they are.*

(29) In Bilsons full Redemption p. 188.

(30) Def. of the Articles of the Prot. Rel. p. 171.

Duræus alledging many testimonis of the Fathers for *Limbus Patrum*, Whitaker his best answere is this, (31) *That I may freely and briefly answere thee what I thinke, one litle word of Scripture vttered, hath more waygbt then a thousand Fathers without Scripture; therefore do not expect whileſt I particularly do wash away these errours of the Fathers.* But Whitaker, and all Heretickes must know, that the Fathers not opposing, but grounding themselues vpon Scripture, as this Section conuinceth, do thus vnanimously teach, Christ his descending into Hell.

(31) Cont. Duræum. l. 8. p. 587.

SECT. IV.

That Protestant writers do teach the Descending of Christ into Hell, and the deliuery from thence of the iust that were in Captiuity.

LAscitius a famous Protestant affirmeth, that, (1) *Abrahams bosome was not in heauen*, And in proofe that the Fathers of the Old Testament were not in heauen before Christs comming, he alleadgeth aswell the (2) *Scriptures* before cited,

(1) De Russorum, Moscouit. & c. Reli. p. 122.

(2) Ib. p. 123.

ted, and the foreſaid *Teſtimony of Thaddaus*, and another of *Ignatius*, as alſo the like anſwerable opinion and Doctrine of the *Hebrewes*, (3) and of the *remote Chriſtians* both in Syria and Æthiopia: and the like plaine teſtimonies for this Doctrine may be ſeene in (4) Peter Martyr, Oecolampadius, and Swinglius.

Our Engliſh Prot. Church teacheth that, (5) *As Chriſt dyed for vs and was buryed, ſo alſo it is to be beleiued, that he went downe into Hell.* And in the Apoſtles Creed in Engliſh meeter they ſing lowdly and luſtily in the Churches, *His ſpirit did after this, deſcend into the lower partes, to them that long in darknes were, the true light of their hartes.* A ſaying ſo euident, that (6) D. Fulke and D. Whitaker, do therfore greatly diſlike it.

Schluſſelburge in proofe of Chriſtes Deſcending, (7) alleadgeth the authority of the Ancient Fathers; and ſaith thus fully: (8) *The Catholicke and Orthodoxall Church of Chriſt hath euer beleiued from the beginning to theſe very tymes the Deſcending of Chriſt, and hath alwayes numbred it amongſt the Articles of Fayth, and hath alwayes proued it by the Teſtimonies of Scripture: Therfore it is not to be ſuffered that, that Article, as added, ſhould be confounded with the reſt, or be wholly taken away by obſtinate Swinglians, deſeruing Hell.*

Caluin affirmeth that, (9) *The ſoules of the faithfull gone out of the bodies, were detayned in Priſon, where they were bound with a burning deſire of Chriſtes comming, becauſe as yet they were not fully enriched with the ſpirit of liberty.* But what other Priſon this was then *Abrahams Boſome*, no man can imagine. This doctrine of Chriſtes deſcending in ſoule into Hell, is taught by D. Hill in his *Defence of the Articles that Chriſt deſcended into Hell*, throughout that Booke: Alſo by D. Bilſon (10) in his *Surney of Chriſtes ſufferings* &c. And *of his deſcent into Hell:* by the Author (11) of Catholicke Traditions: By Luther, Aretius, Apinus, Nowel, and Melanchon, alleadged in (12) Hill his forſaid booke; by the Lutherans generally, & many Caluiniſtes.

Add herunto that ſome Prot. teach, that the ſoules of the Iuſt ſhall not before the day of Iudgment enioy heauen and the ſight of God: ſo Luther (13), ſo the Proteſtants (14) of

(1) *Ibid.*
(4) *Common plac. in Engl. part. 2. c. 18. p. 611. & part. 3. c. 16 p. 377. 378. Oecol in l. Epiſt. Oecolamp. & Swing. l. 1. p. 29. Swingl. ib. l. 3. p. 560. 561.*
(5) Art. of Relig art. 3.
(6) Def. of the Engl. Tranſl. c. 7. p. 104. Whitak. cont. Dur. l. 9. p. 773.
(7) *Theol. Calu. l. 2. f. 146.*
(8) *Ib. l. 2. c. 27.*
(9) *In 1. Pet. c. 3.*
(10) Pag. 650. &c.
(11) Pag. 111.
(12) P. 23. 44. See 33. 34.
(13) *Prælect. in Gen.* And ſee *in c. 9. Eccleſiaſtic. & in Jonam. & in c. 5. Gen.*
(14) See *Laſcipius de Ruſſ.*

of Bohemia, and therto doth Caluin (15) moſt dangerouſly incline. Yea (16) Appinus, (17) Latimer, and ſome (18) other Prot. trembled not to maintayne, that Chriſt did after his bodily death, deſcend into Hell in his ſoule, therin to ſuffer torments of the damned. In ſo much as Melanchon teſtifyeth the diſſenſion had among Prot. concerning this Doctrine. Into ſuch Blaſphemies and abſurdities do Heretickes fall, when they forſake the ſure Rule of the Catholicke Church in the vnderſtanding of Scriptures.

(15) *Inſt. l. 3. c. 20. ſect. 20. & c. 25. ſect. 6.*

(16) *In Pſal. 16.*

(17) In Fulke Def. of the Engl. Tranſl. c. 7 p. 204.

(18) See Melanct. *in Conſil Theol. part. 2. p. 131. & in l. 2. Ep. p 176.* And *Beza in Act. 2.*

SECT. V.

Obiections from Scripture againſt Chriſtes deſcending into Hell, anſwered.

FVlke demandeth, (1) *To what end was Chriſt called the Lambe* (2) *that was ſlaine from the beginning of the world, but that the benefit of his Paſſion extendeth vnto the Godly of all ages alike?* Anſwere. Proteſtants themſelues do vnderſtand (3) only by thoſe words, that his death was ſo long before preordayned of God, and prefigured, and that in the faith of Chriſt, the Iuſt from the beginning of the world, were to be ſaued.

(1) Confut. of Purgat. p. 57.

(2) *Apoc. 13. 8.*

(3) Marg. note of the Engl. Bible of 1576. in Reuel. 13. 8.

Others obiect, that before Chriſtes Aſcenſion, the Theefe was in heauen, to whom our Sauiour ſaid, (4) *This day thou ſhalt be with me in Paradiſe.* Anſw. D. Hill proueth (5) that, *This day may ſignify, for euer*, comparing it with this other Text, (6) *Thou art my ſonne, this day haue I begotten thee*: and ſo it importeth only the perpetuity of the Ioyes promiſed him. Secondly though the words ſhould concerne the only naturall day then preſent, in which Chriſt deſcended into Hell, or *Limbus Patrum*; yet I anſwere with S. Auſtine (7) and Origen, that the foreſaid Hell, or *Limbus Patrum*, was then to the Theefe made a Paradiſe, or a place of bleſſednes by reaſon of the Eſſentiall Beatitude, which as then there accompanied the ſoule of Chriſt. Thirdly I ſay againe with S. Au-

(4) *Luc. 23. 43.*

(5) Def. of Chriſtes Deſc. into Hell. f. 19. 20.

(6) *Pſ. 2. 7.*

(7) *Ep. 57. ad Dardan ſolut. 2. quæſt. Orig. ho. 15. in Gen.*

S. Austine, (8) that even before Christes descending into that place, it was a place of rest freed from sensible paine, and of great blessednes in regard of the great Comfort and Expectation of those that were therin, and was therfore called (9) Abrahams Bosome.

(8) *Ep. 99. ad Euod.*
(9) *Luc. 16. 22.*

CHAP.

CHAP. XV.

The true State of the Queſtion, Concerning Purgatory, and Prayer for the dead.

Whether beſides Heauen and Hell, after this lyfe there be a place of Purgatory, wherein the ſoules of the Faythfull are temporally punished for their ſinnes committed in their lyfe tyme: and whether they may be relieued by the Sacrifices, prayers, and almes of their liuing friends.

Or otherwiſe, that inſtantly after death, euery ſoule eyther immediatly aſcendeth into Heauen, or deſcendeth into Hell.

SECT. I.

Catholike Doctrine.

WHAT the Church of Chriſt vniuerſally teacheth concerning Purgatory, and Prayer for the dead, her irrefragable Decrees will preſently tell vs. For in the Coūcel of Trent it is defined that, (1) *Seeing the Catholike Church inſtructed by the holy Ghoſt, hath taught in Sacred Councels &c. from the holy Scriptures, and ancient Tradition of Fathers, that there is a Purgatory, & that the Soules there detayned are holpen by the ſuffrages of the faythfull, but eſpecially by the acceptable Sacri-*

(1) *Concil. Trident. Seſſ. 25. Decret. de Purgatorio.*

Sacrifice of the Aultar: The holy Synod commandeth Bishops, that they diligently take care, that the wholsome Doctrine of Purgatory, deliuered by holy Fathers, and sacred Councels, be belieued, houlden, taught, and euery where preached by faythfull Christians.

By the first Nicene Councell it was appointed that, (2) *When a Bishop dyeth &c. notice of his death be giuen to all Churches and Monasteries in the Parish, that Prayer may be made for him.* And the lyke is taught in sundry (3) other Councells. In the second Councell Cabilonense, it is thus decreed, (4) *It further seemeth good to vs, that in all the solemnities of Masses, our Lord be prayed in due place for the soules of the dead: for as no day is excepted wherein our Lord is not beseeched for all Necessities, so no day ought to be excepted, but that prayers be powred to our Lord in the solemnities of Masses, for the soules of the faythfull. Therefore the holy Church keepeth anciently this custome, that in the solemnities of Masses, and other prayers, she may commend to our Lord the Soules of the departed &c.* What these Councels haue defined, the Catholike Church (5) still belieueth, to wit, that after this lyfe, for such as dye in the Grace of God, and haue not done due Pennance, for their sinnes, there is a place of Purgatory or satisfaction, wherein they are temporally punished, & may be relieued by the Prayers, Sacrifices, and other good workes done for them by their liuing friends.

(2) Cap. 67. Arab.
(3) Conc. Carth. 3. c. 29. Con. Carth. 4. c. 79. Conc. Florent Sess. Quæst. de Purgatorio.
(4) Cap. 39.
(5) Bellar. de Purg. l. 1. c. 3. &c. & l. 2. c. 15. Rhem. Test. in Mat. 12. 32.

Pointes Disputable.

Some Catholike (6) writers affirme, that *Pœna damni*, the punishment of losse, is the greatest punishment eyther in Purgatory or this life. And that the least paine in Purgatory, is greater then the greatest in this lyfe. But (7) others teach, that the foresaid punishment of losse in Purgatory, is not greater then all the other punishments in Purgatory, or this lyfe. And that the greatest punishment in Purgatory is greater then the greatest Punishment in this life, though some punishment in Purgatory, is lesse then some punishment in this life. M. Rogers (8) obiecteth that Catholickes differ amongst themselues in assigning the place of Purgatory, as whether it be in the center of the Earth, the bottome of the Sea,

(6) S. Tho. in 4. Dist. 20. qu. art. 2.
(7) S. Bonauent. in 4. Dist. 20. q. 2.
(8) Def. of the Art art. 22. p. 122.

Sea, or in Hell. As alſo in the Tormentors, whether they be holy Angels, or diuels; in the Torments, whether they be only by fire, or fire and water, and ſundry ſuch like. All this is true, but impertinent, for none of theſe Points are defyned by the Church.

Proteſtants vntruthes.

Rogers auoucheth that according to Catholikes, (9) *the Pope is God, in that he can at his pleaſure diſcharge guilty ſoules, both from the guilt of ſinne, and from the punishments due for the ſame.* And (10) *Purgatory in another world, both denyed hath alwayes bene by the Greeke Churches &c.* But this appeareth to be moſt falſe, by S. Epiphanius, a Greeke Father, immediatly heerafter cyted, condemning for the ſame Ærius, and in him M. Rogers for hereticks. And I muſt alſo needs condemne M. Rogers for an egregious Lyar, in auouching, that Catholikes affirme the Pope to be God, and that at his pleaſure he can diſcharge guilty ſoules both from fault and punishmēt: both which all Catholikes diſclaime, as meere vntruthes.

(9) Def. of the Art. art. 22. p. 122.

(10) *Ib. p. 128.*

Proteſtant Doctrine.

The Engliſh Proteſtant Church hath Decreed, that (11) *The Romish Doctrine concerning Purgatory &c. is a fond thing, vainly inuented, & grounded vpon no warrant of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the word of God.* According to D. Iewell, (12) *This kind of praying for the Dead is plainly ſuperſtitious, and wanteth all authority of Gods word.* And ſo moſt Prot. *profeſſe* (13) *to believe that the faythfull after the bodily death, go directly vnto Chriſt, and therefore do not ſtand in need of the help or prayers for the Dead, or any ſuch duty of them which are alive. In like manner we believe that the vnbelievers be caſt headlong directly into Hell &c.* This is the ordinary Doctrine of Proteſtants.

(11) Article 22.

(12) *In Art. 18 ſect. 3. p. 158.*

(13) Harm. of Conf. p. 481.

Proteſtants agree with Ancient Hereticks.

Ærius was condemned by S. Auſtine (14) and S. Epi-

(14) *Har. 53.*

phanius (15) for denying prayer for the Dead. (16) I will not diſſemble (ſaith D. Fulke) that which you thinke the greateſt matter: Ærius taught that prayer for the dead was vnprofitable, as witneſſe both Epiphanius and Auſtine, which they count for an errour. And the like of Ærius is acknowledged by (17) D. Field, and ſundry other Proteſtant writers: the ſame hereſy is alſo condemned in the (18) Armenians, and (19) Albigenſes.

(15) Har. 75.
(16) Anſwer to a Counterf. Cath. p. 44. 45.
(17) Of the Church. l. 3. p. 138. Oſiand. cent. 4. p. 414.
(18) Guido de Armenijs.
(19) Caſarius Lib. 8.

Proteſtant Errours.

If it were not that men were drunke with hereſy, they would neuer broach ſuch abſurd and contrary poſitions, as theſe that follow. And firſt that of Brentius (20) *Although it be lawfull to wiſh all things happy to the dead, yet prayer for the dead is vayne*: here is a myſticall difference betweene wiſhing and praying. And yet the like maketh Caluin, (21) *The forme of prayer that God may giue to the dead a good and happy reſurrection, becauſe it doth not ſquare with the Rule of Praying well, he it be reiected: I do not vrge, but that it is lawfull to conceiue ſuch a deſire.* Here a man may lawfully conceiue a Deſire of a thing, and yet muſt not pray for it.

(20) In Dominic. 12. poſt Trinit.
(21) Ep. 368.

Caluin affirmeth that, (22) *A certaine Prot. ſaid often, there was no better ſhort way to take away the Patronages of Saintes, ſuperſtitious Prayers for the dead, the fiction of Purgatory, and the like, then if we ſhould beliue death to be the deſtruction of ſoules.* And certainly that man ſaid very wiſely, ſuppoſing that he could make that beliefe good of the mortality of the ſoule. But who doth not heerby well diſcerne, the deſperate caſe of them, who thinke it the beſt and ſhorteſt way to impugne the truth, to fall into Atheiſme, and ſo at once to pull vp all Religion by the roote?

(22) In Explicat Perfidiæ Gentilis. p. 677.

SECT.

SECT. II.

It is proued by Scriptures, that after this life there is a place of Purgatory: and that therin the ſoules of the faithfull may be relieued by the Sacrifices Prayers, and other ſpirituall helpes of their liuing friends.

THis truth is manifeſtly taught in the Bookes of Machabees, by the Charitable fact of Iudas Machabæus, (1) *who making a gathering he ſent 12000. drachmes of ſiluer to Hieruſalem, for ſacrifice to be offered for ſinnes, well and religiouſly thinking of the Reſurrection.* (*For vnleſſe he hoped that they that were ſlaine ſhould ryſe againe, it ſhould ſeeme ſuperfluous, and vaine to pray for the dead.*) *And becauſe he conſidered, that they which had taken their ſleepe with Godlines, had very good Grace layd vp for them. It is therfore a holy and healthfull Cogitation, to pray for the dead, that they may be looſed from their ſinnes.* This place is ſo conuincing for Purgatory, and prayer for the dead, that for want of all other anſwere, Prot. preſſed herewith, are forced to betake themſelues to that ſhamfull, laſt, and deſperat refuge, of denying the Bookes of Machabees to be Canonicall Scripture. The wickednes and falſhood of which anſwere is (2) heretofore moſt euidently diſcouered. (1) 2. Machab. 12. 43. 44. 45. (2) See before Chap. 3. &c.

This alſo may be confirmed by the Example of Dauid, and the whole people of God, and more particularly by the ſingular *ſeauen dayes faſt* of the men of Iabes Galaad, for the death of their K. and maiſter Saul. And firſt as the Princely Prophet (3) *Faſted and wept for his ſicke Child whiles it was aliue*, as thinking therby to obtaine that the *Child might liue*: *But when the child was dead, he did ryſe vp and eate*, and ſo gaue ouer faſting. (for Infants who dye freed from originall ſin ſtand not in need of any further prayer or ſuffrage, becauſe they neuer committed any actuall ſinne, therby to deſerue punishment.) So alſo after the death of Saul and Ionathas, it is ſaid, that heathen king with all his Court & people, in like manner *mourned* (4) *wept, and faſted for them.* Neither could this faſting ſo generally made be only in ſigne of ſor- (3) 2. Reg. 12. 21. (4) 2. Reg. 1. 12.

row for the losse or death of a friend, wheras the fast was
(5) 1. Reg. 31. 13. extended by the men of Iabes Galaad to seauen (5) dayes, which to do only for sorrow, were vnlawfull. (6) *immoderate*,
(6) 1. Thess. 4. 13. vnreasonable, vnworthy the people of God, and the approbation of so great a Prophet, and incomparably more then he either did, or permitted to be done, vpon the death of his owne Child: Therefore the probable Collection hence to be made is this, that as he wept and fasted for his sicke Child being yet alyue, not altogeather for sorrow, but especially that God would haue mercy vpon the Child, that it might liue: so in like manner he wept and fasted, blessed the men of Iabes Galaad, for showing mercy vnto their Lord and King, all which he did and approued to be done for Saul and Ionathas, being dead, not only in signe of sorrow, but chiefly to obtaine mercy for them, as hoping of their Repentance before their death, and that they were capable of reliefe, by this mercy, of the liuing showed to them.

But to come now to the Scriptures of the New Testament, which do strongly confirme the same: first, these words of our Sauiour seeme very expresse, (7) *And whosoeuer shall speake a word against the sonne of Man, it shalbe forgiuen him; but he that shall speake against the holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiuen him, neither in this world, nor in the world to come.* The conclusion hence deduced is, therfore at least some other sinnes may be forgiuen in the world to come; but in Hell there is no remission, since out of Hell there is no redeption, & in Heauen there needed no remission, since none polluted with sinne can enter thither, therfore a third place must be admitted, where those sinnes may be forgiuen.
(7) Mat. 12. 32.

Some reply that Christ compareth heere some sinnes with others, to wit, sinne against the Father and the sonne, with sinne against the holy Ghost, therfore if he meane, that any sinnes may be remitted in the world to come, chiefly those which he compareth with the sinne against the holy Ghost, but not these, seeing only veniall sinnes are there remitted. But the answere is easy, for Christ speaketh of a full and perfect Remission, including remission both of fault & Punishment, and so not only veniall, but also mortall sinnes,

nes, are pardoned in the next world, becauſe the guilt or fault of Mortall ſinne being in this world pardoned, but the puniſhment not alwayes here ſatisfyed, but afterwards diſcharged in Purgatory, the remiſſion therfore euen of mortall ſinnes is there perfected.

Others yet would euade by affirming, that of a negatiõ doth not neceſſarily follow an affirmation, as for example (ſay they) king Iohn is not king of the Venetians, therfore ſome other is their king: or, finall impenitence ſhall not be forgiuen in this world, nor in hell, therfore ſome ſinnes may be forgiuen in hell. But this forceth nothing, for although the Rule be not ſo generall, that euery negation doth inforce an affirmation to follow vpon it: yet in our preſent caſe, it muſt needs follow, ſince it were impertinent to ſay, this ſinne ſhall not be forgiuen in this world, nor in the next, if none could be forgiuen in the next; euen as it were impertinent to ſay, King Charles will neither pardon thee in Englãd, nor in Spaine, ſince in Spaine he hath no authority to pardon. And therfore as it is well ſaid, king Charles will neither pardon thee in England, nor in Ireland, nor in Scotland, becauſe he hath equall power of pardoning in thoſe places; euen ſo proportionably it is fitly ſaid by our Sauiour, that Blaſphemy againſt the holy Ghoſt, ſhall neither be forgiuen in this world, nor in the world to come, partly for that our Sauiour hath equall power to pardon in both places, and partly for that this double Diſtribution of tyme and place, I meane this world and the next, equally belongeth to Gods Iudgment ſeate; and laſtly for that this World, ſignifying a tyme, and Hell a place, are not oppoſite members in the diuiſion vſed by our Sauiour, as this world and the next be. And moſt certaine it is, and granted by all, that by the next world cannot be meant hell, ſince out of Hell there is no redemption, as in hell there is no remiſſion.

Laſtly, it is obiected againſt this place, that whereas S. Matthew ſayth, *neither in this world, nor in the world to come*, S. Marke (a ſure Interpreter of theſe wordes (ſayth (8) D. Fulke) *explicateth the ſame, ſaying*, (9) *he hath not forgiuenes for euer.*

(8) Againſt Rhem. Teſt. in Mat. 12. 32.

(9) C. 3. 29.

for euer. This euasion being a meer illusion of the text, will not serue D. Fulkes turne, for euery one who explicateth ought to be larger, then he whome he explicateth; now S. Marke is not larger then S. Matthew, but contrariwise S. Matthew is larger then S. Marke, and therefore S. Markes briefly touched neuer-forgiuenes, is dilated and explicated by Saint Matthew his distribution, *neither in this world, nor in the world to come*: since it is euident, that *neuer-forgiuenes* importeth both tymes of this world and the next, where sinnes may be forgiuen. Besids this manner of obiecting, is of set purpose a willfull mistaking of the point vrged, for without all Conference or explication falsly by D. Fulke supposed to be vsed by S. Marke, it is manifest of it selfe, that he who is not forgiuen neither in this world, nor in the world to come, shall neuer be forgiuen; what needeth then any Explication to be added by S. Marke in a point so cleer.

(10) *Mat.* 5. 26. 27. (11) *Orig ho.* 35. *in Luc. Ambr. in c.* 12. *Luc. Hieron ep* 8. *ad Demet.* (12) *Hilar. & Hieron. in Mat.* 5. (13) *Ambr. in Luc.* 12. *Aug. in Mat.* 5 *& ho.* 2. *de verbis Dom. Greg. ho* 39. (14) *Io.* 5. 22. The Father hath giuen all iudgment to the sonne. (15) *Ambr. in Luc. c.* 4. *Aug. l.* 1 *de ser. Dom. in Monte c.* 21. (16) *Greg. ho.* 39. *Theophil. in Luc.* 12.

A second place for Purgatory, is that Exhortation of our Sauiour concerning reconciliation, (10) *Be at agreement with thy aduersary betymes, whilest thou art in the way with him: least perhaps the aduersary deliuer thee to the Iudge, and the Iudge deliuer thee to the Officer, and thou be cast into Prison. Amen. I say vnto thee, thou shalt not go out from thence, till thou repay the last farthing*: Heer by the *way*, is vnderstood this present life, by *prison* (out of which there is no cōming, vntil the vttermost *farthing* be payd) *hell*, in which there are many mansions, some for the damned, and others for those that are to be purged: by the *Aduersary*, (11) some vnderstand the *Diuell*, (12) others, some other man, but (13) most, *the Law of God*, or *God himselfe*, as he commandeth things contrary to the flesh; or the *Conscience*, which obiecteth to a sinner the breach of Gods law; all may be true, as meant by that all-seeing spirit: but howsoeuer it be taken it litle importeth, as not hindering the maine point hence to be inferred. The (14) *Iudge*, all agree to be Christ, the *officer*, the good (15) Angell or the (16) Diuells, eyther is probable: by the *last farthing* little sinnes are vnderstood. Now of this it followeth, that there is a place of imprisonment, after this lyfe, forth of which there is an out-coming, when the *vttermost farthing* is discharged.

Now

Now whereas some obiect that, vntill, doth not signify a certaine determined tyme, but Eternity, accordingly as where it is sayd of the B. Virgin Mary, (17) *He knew her not till she brought forth her first borne sonne*, as much as to say, he had neuer knowledge of her: the answere is, that this is a wilfull dissembling of the point vrged, for the word, *vntill*, or before, though it signify a determined time, yet it referreth the accomplishment of that tyme, not to that which goeth before the sayd word, but only to that which followeth the same: and so, for so much as it is sayd, *he knew her not vntill* (or before) *she brought forth her sonne*; the argumẽt hence is good, that therefore she brought forth a sonne, and that before his birth Ioseph did not know her: but it neyther inferreth this knowledge, or not knowledge of her, after the birth of that sonne. And so likewise in our present case, where it is sayd, *Thou shalt not go out from thence, vntill thou repay the laste farthing*, proueth, that the *vttermost farthing* may be payd, and so the prisoner discharged. Which truth yet appeareth more plainly by the end and scope of the Parable, for the similitude is not taken from a murtherer, theefe, or traitour, who are ordinarily condemned to death, or perpetuall imprisonment; but from a debtour, who not for any crime, but for debt, is cast into prison, vntill he pay the same, the which ordinarily after some tyme he doth, and so is freed. (17) *Mat.* 1. 25.

The third place for proofe of this Doctrine, is that of the Apostle S. Paul, (18) *And if any man build vpon this foundation, gould, siluer, or precious stones, wood, hay, stubble, the worke of euery one shalbe manifest; for the day of our Lord will declare, because it shalbe reuealed in fyre, and the worke of euery one of what kind it is, the fyre shall try: if any mans worke abyde, which he hath builded thereupon, he shall receyue reward; if any mans worke burne, he shall suffer detriment: but himselfe shalbe saued, yet so as by fyre.* The Apostle heere vseth the similitude of two workmen, the one building his house vpon a stony and solid foundation of precious matter, which feareth not fire, as gould, siluer, & precious stones: the other building vpon the the like solid foundation, but after the manner of poore men, of (18) 1 Cor. 3. 11. 12. 13. 14. 15.

wood, clay, couering the ſame with hay or ſtraw. Now ſuppoſing fire were put to theſe two houſes, & the workmē with in them, the firſt would receaue no hurt, but the other would ſhortly be conſumed with fyre, and if the workman within will eſcape, he muſt paſſe through the fyre: In which paſſage though he dye not, yet ſhall he receiue ſome hurt or payne. In this ſimilitude, by the *builders*, (19) ſome vnderſtand all *Chriſtians*; Others (20) *Paſtours and Preachers*, which ſenſe is more literall, as may be gathered by the wordes precedent and ſubſequent. By the *foundation* is vnderſtood *Chriſt preached*, and made knowne by the Apoſtles. *By gould, ſiluer, & precious ſtones*, is vnderſtood the profitable, *and wholſome doctrine* of other preachers, who inſtruct them that already believe, by word and example. *By wood, hay, and ſtubble*, is vnderſtood doctrine not hereticall or falſe, but curious, vayne, and vnprofitable, which ſome preach to Catholike people, but not with that fruite, which God requireth, but rather with veniall ſinnes in themſelues; a fault whereunto the Corinthians were addicted. By the *day of our Lord*, is vnderſtood the day of Iudgment, partly for that the word, *day*, is ſo taken in (21) other places of Scripture; partly for that here in this life euery ones worke is not tryed, tribulations being common both to the good and euill; partly for that the Greeke Article going before the word in the originall, (22) hath an Emphaſis in it, importing as much as, (23) *dies illa*, or *dies Domini*; and laſtly for that *dies Domini* doth vſually (24) ſignify the day of Iudgment. By the *fyre* which ſhall try the worke of euery one, cannot be vnderſtood the fyre of Hell or Purgatory, or of that fyre which ſhall conſume the world at the day of Iudgment, for all theſe being fyres for puniſhments, cannot try thoſe who haue built *gould, ſiluer, and precious ſtones*, vpon the foundation Chriſt; therfore the *fyre* heere meant, is the fyre of Gods Iudgment, which ſhall not purge or torment, but try and examine euery mans worke. By *fyre* in the laſt place where it is ſaid, *he ſhalbe ſaued, yet ſo as by fyre*, muſt needs be vnderſtood ſome temporall and Purgatiue puniſhment, to which ſuch are iudged after death, as in their particular Iudgment are found to haue

(19) *Aug. l. de fide & oper. c. 16. & in Enchyr. c. 68.*

(20) *Ambr. & Sedulius in hunc loc.*

(21) *2. Tim 1. 12. 18. 2. Tim. 4. 8. Hebr. 10. 25. Rom. 2. 16.*

(22) *ἡ ἡμέρα.*

(23) *1. Cor. 5. 5. 2. Cor. 1. 14. Philip. 1. 6. 10. 1. Theſſ. 5. 2. 2. Theſſ. 1. 10.*

(24) *2. Pet. 3. 10. Luc. 17. 24. 26.*

haue builded *wood, hay* &c. and that therby cannot be meant *Hell-fyre*, is playne, in that it is ſaid, *they ſhalbe ſaued*, nor the fyre which ſhall burne the world at Doomſ-day, for then thoſe who committed veniall ſinnes could not enter into heauen before the day of Iudgment: nor yet, as Caluin and other Prot. would, by *fyre*, vnderſtand the Iudgment of God approuing ſound Doctrine and confuting falſe, which happeneth (ſay they) when a man is conuerted, and chiefly in the houre of death, at which tyme many are enlightened, and ſo perceiue themſelues to haue bene deceiued, at which they are aſhamed, and ſo are *ſaued as by fyre*. But this Explication is falſe: for firſt, many who haue builded ſtubble &c. dye ſo ſodainly, as that they haue no tyme for repentance and amendment of their Errors, and yet they ſhall not be damned, becauſe they had Chriſt for their foundation; and the Apoſtle auoucheth of all ſuch, that they are *ſaued*; neither can they be ſaued, vnleſſe Purgatory be admitted, becauſe ſeeing they dyed in the ſtubble, hay, and ſtraw of their veniall ſinnes, they cannot be ſaued, *but as by fyre*. Secondly, he that ſhall be ſaued, yet as by fyre, ſhall *ſuffer detriment*, or as the originall hath it, ζημιωθήσεται, *ſhalbe punished*; wheras he that is enlightened to ſee and follow the truth, therby receiueth gaine, comfort, and reward: euen as he would not thinke himſelfe to ſuffer leſſe, who hauing found a counterfait Diamond, at firſt thinking it good, perceiuing afterwards his errour, ſhould haue a true one giuen him inſteed therof.

Some reply that S. Paul in the ſame ſentence would not vſe the word, *fyre*, ſo diuerſly, as for the Iudgment of God, & Purgatory fyre. But beſides the former reaſons proouing the different acception of the word, *fyre*, to be neceſſary, S. Paul vſeth one and the ſelfe ſame word of, *ſinne*, in other places in a double ſignification: for example, (25) *him that knew no ſinne, he made ſinne for vs*, and in another place (26) *euen of ſinne, damned ſinne*; where in both places, *ſinne*, ſignifieth a Sacrifice for ſinne, as alſo the tranſgreſſion of the law.

(25) 2. Cor. 5. 21.

(26) Rom 8. 3.

Others reply, that as the other words, *gold, ſiluer, building*

&c. are taken Metaphorically. So alſo may the word, *fyre*, be taken, and the rather, for that it is not ſaid, *they ſhalbe ſaued by fyre*, as though it were a true fyre, but, *as by fyre*, to inſinuate thereby vnto vs, a ſimilitudinary, or metaphoricall fyre only. By the like reaſon the wordes, *worke, ſaued, Chriſt*, and the like being in the ſame ſentence, ſhould be taken metaphorically, which is abſurd. And as for the word, *as*, or, *quaſi*, it doth not ſignify a ſimilitude with fyre, but with one paſſing through the tyre, ſo that the ſenſe is, he that buildeth *hay* &c. ſhalbe ſaued, but after the manner of him, who to come to ſome place, paſſeth through the tyre: yea the word, *quaſi*, doth not alwayes extenuate the truth of the thing, but doth ſometymes much ſtrengthen & confirme the ſame, as where it is ſaid (27) *We ſaw the glory of him, glory as it were (quaſi) of the only begotten of the Father*, that is, we ſaw him glorious, as became the only begotten ſonne of God.

(27) Io.1.14.

Thirdly, it is pretended that this place is obſcure, & admitteth great variety of Interpretations, both by the Fathers, and others, wherfore it cannot be of force to proue any point of Faith. By the ſame reaſon many other places of Scriptures, eſpecially the Epiſtles of S. Paul, (which in the Iudgment of S. Peter are *hard*) might not be vſed in argument againſt Heretickes. Againe, are the Scriptures hard & obſcure, and ſo granted to be by Prot. here being preſſed with this place for proofe of Purgatory, as indeed they be, both of themſelues, or notwithſtanding any Conference of other places; how then ſtādeth this with their pretēded facility of Scripture at other times? Laſtly, as for variety of Interpretatiō, it is no let for proofe of doctrine, when one place (as I haue formerly (28) proued) may admit many true literal ſenſes, ſo long as the ſame are not repugnant to themſelues, to other places, or pointes of faith: yea what one place almoſt is not diuerſly interpreted, by ancient Fathers, and yet all ſenſes may be meant by the holy Ghoſt, who indited the Scriptures. And do not Prot. themſelues bring diuers Interpretations of one and the ſame Scripture?

(28) See heretofore Preparatiue, ſect. 7.

Fourthly, S. Paul (29) prouing the Reſurrection, amongſt other argumēts, vſeth this for one, propoſed by way

(29) 1. Cor. 15. 29.

of

of Interrogation, intimating this great absurdity, following vpon the deniall of the Resurrection, *What shall they doe that are baptized for the dead, if the dead ryse not at all? why then are they baptized for the dead?* Here whether we take it, that the Apostle (in proofe of the resurrection of the dead) doth reason from the Errour of those, who knowing the great force of *Baptisme*, and thinking the dead were in case to be relieued, did, vpon these true grounds, erroneously practise to be baptized for, and in the name of their dead friends, (an Errour reported of those beginning tymes by S. (30) Epiphanius) or that in this place by *Baptisme* he vnderstand the *Baptisme of Teares and Penance*, vndertaken for the dead by Almes, fasting, and prayer, in which like sense of voluntary affliction, the word, *Baptisme*, is often vsed in the Scriptures (31) and (32) Fathers. Now this place taken in either sense, proueth, that in the Common opinion of those tymes, the dead were in case to be relieued. This argument is so conuincing, that the Protestant Danæus (33) doth therfore in answere hereto vnderstand in this place by the *Dead*, *not* (sayth he) *those who are naturally dead, but such as are liuing vpon Earth, and dead in sinne*, directly against the forsaid words and circumstances of the place, which do most manifestly concerne the Resurrection of the dead.

(30) *Har.* 28.

(31) *Mat.* 20. 22. 23. *Mar.* 10. 38. 39. *Luc.* 12. 50. And *Marc.* 1. 4. *Luc.* 3. 3. *Act.* 13. 24. & 19. 4.

(32) *Cypr. de cœna Dom. Nazianz. Orat. de Epiphania.*

S. Iohn directeth and inuiteth our Prayes for the dead, saying, (34) *He that knoweth his brother to sinne a sinne not to death, let him aske, and life shall be giuen him, sinning not to death. There is a sinne to death, for that I say not, that any man aske.* Hence Purgatory is proued two wayes, for first by a *sinne to death*, all vnderstand finall impenitence, and for such dying impenitently in mortall sinne, we are forbidden to pray, whereby it is insinuated, and we admonished, that for such as dye in sinnes repented, or which are not mortall, we may lawfully pray.

(33) *Conf. Bellar. 1 part. alt. parte. p. 1174.*

(34) *Ep. 3. 16.*

Secondly, whereas we are forbidden heer to pray for certayne sinners, and allowed to pray for certayne others, to wit, for such as sinne not to death, this place must be vnderstood eyther of prayer for the liuing, or for the dead; if of prayer for the dead, then it proueth the thing in question,

namely that as we are forbidden to pray for ſome dead, ſo alſo we are admoniſhed to pray for others. And that it cannot be meant of prayer for the liuing, is proued by the forſayd ſinne vnto death, for which we are forbidden to pray, and whereof S. Auſtine ſayth accordingly, (35) *If any vnto death haue an impenitent hart &c. doth the Church pray for them, that is, for the ſoules of ſuch departed?* And this cannot be meant of any ſinne of the liuing, becauſe there is no ſinne ſo great and haynous, but we may (without particular Reuelation to the contrary) lawfully pray for the remiſſion thereof, and for the amendement and conuerſion of the Committer thereof, whyleſt he is yet liuing. And though there were a degree of ſinne ſo grieuous in this life, as were irremiſſible, (the contrary whereof the learnedſt of the Prot. (37) writers affirme) yet were the committing thereof in others, knowne to God only, for we are not able to diſcerne the ſecrets of the hart, much leſſe to know, if the party haue proceeded to that height of iniquity, and therefore this ſinne (though admitting there were any ſuch) cannot be the ſin meant in this place, for the remiſſion whereof, we are forbidden to pray.

(35) *De ciu. l.21.c.14.* And ſee *Conc. Brachar.1.c.34.*

(37) *Vrbanus Regius loc. com.c.de pec. fol. 20. 21. Wigandus. Syntag. Col. 380.581. 584. Chem. in Enchyr.p. 269. 273.* Smyth in his Treatiſe of prayer in generall for all men &c.

Now wheras ſome obiect, that the Prophet Hieremy was forbidden to pray for the Iewes then liuing, (38) *Thou therfore pray not for this people, & take not to thee praiſe and prayer for them:* therefore we may not pray for all ſinners during lyfe. To this the anſwere is firſt, that the Prophet had a ſpeciall Reuelation to the contrary, and therefore might not do it. Secondly, this obiection is impertinent, for he was not forbidden to pray for the Remiſſion of their ſinnes, but for remiſſion onely of the (39) *plague*, or temporall puniſhment which they ſhould not eſcape by Gods Decree: which is nothing to this preſent purpoſe, where we ſpeake of praying for the Remiſſion of ſinne.

(38) C. 11.14.

(39) Hier. 11. 11 11.23.

SECT.

SECT. III.

The ancient Fathers expound the forſayd Scriptures agreably with Catholikes in proofe of Purgatory, and Prayer for the Dead.

BEcauſe (1) D. Fulke thinketh, *It is ſufficient, for* (Prot.) *that; neither the Scripture teacheth Purgatory, neyther the Primitiue Church did admit of it for many hundred yeares after Chriſt &c.* and that, *S. Auſtine doth not affirme any thing certaine of it;* as I haue next before proued our Doctrine of Purgatory from ſundry cleereſt Textes of Scripture, ſo now I intend the like by the Ancient Fathers, and particularly by S. Auſtine. S. Auſtine then hauing taught that ſome depart this lyfe ſo bad, that they are incapable of any reliefe by their liuing friends, and others ſo good, that they need not the ſame; doth yet notwithſtanding in proofe of the practiſe of the Catholike Church praying for ſuch departed, as in their lyfe tyme merited the ſame, further confirme the ſame out of the Booke of the Machabees in theſe wordes following, (2) *We read in the Booke of the Machabees Sacrifice offered for the dead, but although it were nowhere at all read in the Old Teſtament, yet notwithſtanding not ſmall is the authority of the vniuerſall Church, which ſhyneth with this Cuſtome; where the Commendation of the Dead hath its place in the prayers of the Prieſt, which are powred to our Lord God at his Aultar.*

(1) Againſt Rhem. Teſt. in Mat 12. 32.

(2) *L. de cura pro mort. c. 1.*

Here S. Auſtine teacheth firſt, that the bookes of Machabees are part of the Old Teſtament; Secondly that the ſaid bookes do teach Sacrifice offered for the dead; Thirdly that though it were not taught in the old Teſtament, or the Scriptures, yet the authority of the vniuerſall Church, which ſhyneth with this Cuſtome, would ſuffice; Fourthly, that Prieſtes at the Aultar, did powre out their prayers to God for the dead. And laſtly as Prot. reiect the bookes of Machabees, becauſe they teach Sacrifice, and prayer for the dead: ſo S. Auſtine belieueth, and approueth Sacrifice, and prayer

prayer for the dead, becauſe (amongſt other reaſons) they are taught in the ſaid bookes.

The ſame S. Auſtine likewiſe in proofe of the ſame Doctrine, expoũdeth the forſaid place of S. Mathew thus, (3) *for neither could it be truly ſayd of certaine, that they ſhould not be forgiuen neither in this world, nor in the world to come; vnleſs there were ſome who though they were not forgiuen in this world, yet ſhould be in the world to come.* Conforme to S. Auſtine ſaith S. Gregory, (4) *So as a man departeth hence, ſo is he to be preſented in iudgement; but yet purging fire of certayne light ſinnes, before the generall Iudgement, is to be beleeued to be, in that Truth ſayth: Becauſe, if any ſhall blaſpheme againſt the holy Ghoſt, he ſhall neither be forgiuen in this world, nor in the world to come: In which ſentence there is giuen vs to vnderſtand, that certayne ſinnes may be forgiuen vs in this world, and that certaine may be releaſed in the world to come; for that which is denyed of one, in true conſequence is granted of ſome.* With theſe accordeth S. Iſidore, ſaying, (5) *When our Lord ſayth, He that ſinneth againſt the holy Ghoſt, ſhall not be forgiuen neither in this world, nor in the world to come, he doth demonſtrate, that vnto ſome, ſinnes are there to be forgiuen, and to be purged with a certaine Purgatory fire.* So expreſſeare the Fathers expoſitions of thoſe wordes of our Sauiour in behalfe of Purgatory.

Now touching the fathers interpreting thoſe other words of our Sauiour, *Agree with thy Aduerſary &c.* Origen writeth thus, (6) *Although a releaſement out of Priſon be ſomtymes promiſed, yet it is deſigned, that none can get forth thence, but he which payeth the vttermoſt farthing.* With Origen agreeth S. Cyprian ſpeaking of the ſame Text thus: (7) *It is one thing to ſtand waiting for pardon, another thing to come to glory: one thing for one to be caſt into Priſon, and not to come forth vntill he haue payd the vttermoſt farthing, another thing immediatly to receyue the reward of faith and vertue: one thing, that one tormented a long tyme for ſinnes, be amended and purged long by fire, another to haue purged all ſinnes by ſuffering, or Martyrdome.* With Origen and S. Cyprian agreeth Euſebius Emiſſenus, his words are theſe: (8) *But theſe who haue done things worthy of temporary punishment, ſhall paſſe through a flood of fire, to whome the word of God is directed, that they do not goe out thence, till they pay the vtmoſt farthing.* Which vtmoſt farthing S. Hie-

(3) *De Ciu. Dei. l. 21. c. 13.*

(4) *Lib. 4. Dial. c. 39.*

(5) *De Offic. Eccleſiaſticis. c. 8. q. 818.*

(6) *In Ep. ad Rom. & ho. 35. in Lucam ho. 14. in Leuit. ho. 25. in Num ho. 2. in Pſ. 38. ho 12. in Hieremiam. & l. 8. in Rom. c. 11.*

(7) *Epiſt. 52. ad Antoniaum poſt med* See alſo S. Cyprian in his 66. Epiſtle. & *l. 3. ad Quirinum. c. 17.*

(8) *Ho. 1 de Epiphania.*

Hierome expoundeth to be *little ſinnes*, ſaying, (9) *This is that which he ſaith, Thou ſhalt not go out of Priſon, vntill thou ſhalt pay euen to thy litle ſinnes.* Laſtly S. Bernard, (10) *Know ye this, that after this life in purging places, thoſe things which are here neglected, are to be paid a hundred fould, euen vnto the laſt farthing.* So certainly are theſe words of our Sauiour, vnderſtood of Purgatory by the Ancient Fathers.

(9) *In c. 5. Mat.* And ſee *S. Ambr. in Luc. c. 12. Tertul. l. de anima c. 35.*

(10) *De obitu Theodoſii.*

But to Examine now, what the Fathers thought of that hard place of S. Paul. 1 *Cor. 3. &c.* S. Ambroſe expoundeth it thus, (11) *But whereas S. Paul ſaith, yet ſo as by fyre, he ſheweth indeed that he ſhalbe ſaued, but yet ſhall ſuffer the punishment of fyre, that being purged by fyre he may be ſaued, and not be tormented for euer, as the Infidels are, with Euerlaſting fyre.*

(11) *Ser. 20. in Pſ. 118. & S. Hier. in c. 4. Amos. & l. 2. in Iorem. poſt med. & in fine Comment. in Iſaiam.*

With S. Ambroſe agreeth S. Auſtine, writing thus, (12) *Purge me in this lyfe, and make me ſuch a one, as ſhall not further need the amending fyre, being for them which ſhalbe ſaued yet ſo as by fyre: wherfore, but becauſe here they build vpon the foundation wood, hay, and ſtubble: but if they ſhould build gold, and ſiluer, and precious ſtones, they ſhould be ſecure from both fyres, not only from that euerlaſting, which ſhall torment the wicked for euer, but alſo from that which ſhall amend ſuch as ſhalbe ſaued by fyre. For it is ſaid, he ſhalbe ſaued, yet ſo, as it were by fyre. And becauſe it is ſaid, he ſhalbe ſaued, this fyre is contemned: yea verily although they are ſaued by fyre, yet notwithſtanding that fyre is more grieuous, then whatſoeuer a man may ſuffer in this lyfe.* Againe, (13) *There are many, who not rightly vnderſtanding this reading, are deceiued with falſe ſecurity, whileſt they beliue, that if they build Capitall ſinnes vpon the foundation of Chriſt, thoſe ſinnes may be purged by tranſitory fyre, and they afterwards come to lyfe euerlaſting. This vnderſtanding &c. is to be corrected, becauſe they deceiue themſelues, who ſo flater themſelues; for with that tranſitory fyre, wherof the Apoſtle ſaid, He ſhalbe ſaued, yet ſo as by fyre, not Capital (or deadly) but litle ſinnes are purged.* So cleere is S. Auſtine for the difference of litle and great ſinnes, and of temporall and eternall fyre in the next lyfe,

(12) *De Gen. cont. Manich. c. 10. & l. 12. de Ciu. c. 13.*

(13) *Serm. 41. de Sanct. prope init.*

S. Gregory expoundeth the ſame words to the ſame ſenſe, making the like difference of litle & great ſinnes, ſaying, (14) *Seeing Paul affirmeth Chriſt to be the foundation, he addeth, If any ſhall build vpon this foundation, gould, ſiluer, precious ſtones, wood,*

(14) *Lib. 4. Dial. c. 39.* See the like *in Pſ. 1. Pœnit. prope init & Pſ. 3. Pœnit. init.*

wood, hay, ſtubble, the worke of euery one what kind it is, fire ſhall try: if any mans worke abyde which he built thereupon, he ſhall receyue reward. If any mans worke burne, he ſhall ſuffer detriment, but himſelfe ſhalbe ſaued, yet ſo as by fyre. Although this may be vnderſtood, *of the fyre of Tribulation giuen vs in this lyfe; yet if any ſhall vnderſtand it of the fire of future purging, it is diligently to be conſidered that he ſayth, he may be ſaued by fyre, not he who buildeth vpon this foundation, Iron, braſſe, or lead, that is greater ſinnes, and therfore harder, and then vnſatisfyſable: but wood, hay, ſtubble, that is, litle ſinnes, and the lighteſt, which fyre may eaſily conſume.*

S. Chriſoſtome proueth Sacrifice for the dead, by the fact of Iob, ſaying, (15) *If the Sacrifice of the Father did ſatisfy for the ſonnes* (16) *of Iob, why doſt thou doubt, whether we ſacrificing for them, who haue departed, they haue any comfort therby? for God is accuſtomed to beſtow his benefits vpon ſome, for others.*

(15) Ho. 42. in. 1. Cor. See ho. 3. in Ep. ad Philip.
(16) Iob. 1. 5.

To conclude, the Fathers are ſo cleere in this, that D. Fulke (directly contrary to what he ſaid before) acknowledgeth that, (17) *Auſtine de civ. Dei. l. 21. c. 13. concludeth very clearly, that ſome ſuffer temporall paines after this lyfe, this may not be denyed.* And, (18) *Auſtine ſpeaketh indeed of the amending fyre, &c. but had no ground of that fyre, but in the common errour of his tyme.* Againe, (19) *In the buryall of Conſtantine is mention of prayer for his ſoules, according to the errour of the tyme.* (20) *Ambroſe indeed alloweth prayer for the dead: it was a common errour of his tyme.* M. Gifford affirmeth, that, (21) *This corruption of prayer for the dead was generall in the Church, long before the dayes of Auſtine &c. It was the practiſe of the Church in generall, and the Corruption ſo ancient, that Tertullian ſayth, It was obſerued by Tradition from the Apoſtles &c. The Doctrine of Purgatory was crept in alſo.* So ancient and generall was the Doctrine of Purgatory, and Prayer, and Sacrifice for the dead.

(17) Conſut. of Purg. p. 110.
(18) Ibid. p. 78.
(19) Ibid. p. 319. See Cent. 4. c. 6.
(20) Lib. p. 320. 326.
(21) Demonſtration. pg. Brownifles. pa. 38.

SECT.

SECT. IV.

Purgatory, and Prayer for the dead taught, and believed by Proteſtantes themſelues.

IOhn Huſſe expreſſy teacheth that, (1) *The vniuerſall Church is deuided into three parts, the Church militant, triumphant, and dormitant &c. The Church dormitant is the number of the Predeſtinate ſuffering in Purgatory &c.* The bleſſed in this lyfe do help with their *prayers, faſtinges and Almes, and other holy workes, the holy dormitants of the Church, that they may goe out of the paines of Purgatory, and be ſooner placed in the Country of the bleſſed.* By the Vniuerſity of Prage it was thus decreed, (2) *We confeſſe euen with beliefe 3. receptacles of ſoules looſed from the flesh, to wit, Heauen, Purgatory, and Hell.* Perzibran doubteth not to ſay, (3) *I profeſſe and firmly believe, that a place of Purgatory fyre after this lyfe of ſoules departed from the body, and to be ſaued, not beeres fully purged by the remedy of ſatisfaction, is to be placed: and that the faithfull here in the way, for the band of Charity and ſpirit, may and ought pioufly help them, by faſting, prayers, almes, and other holy Oblations. Almoſt all Doctours do ground this opinion vpon the words of Chriſt, ſaying: Some ſinne, not to be forgiuen neither in this world, nor in the world to come.*

D. Martin Luthers Confeſſion of faith, is this, (4) *I do believe there is a Purgatory;* And againe, (5) *I am ſure that there is a Purgatory:* which Doctrine he doth there more at large defend, calling it, (6) *Fidem totſæculorum, the beliefe of ſo many ages.* Yea, (7) *I neuer denied Purgatory.* And, *I yet believe it, as I haue often written and confeſſed.* And, (8) *I know not hing of Purgatory, but that ſoules there ſuffer to be holpen by our Prayers and workes. It ſufficeth that we know them to ſuffer, and that we ought to helpe them &c.* Laſtly the ſaid D. Luther in another place is ſo confident of this Doctrine, that he concludeth thus, (9) *I do ſtrongly believe, yea I dare auouch I know, that there is a Purgatory, for I am eaſily induced that there is mention made thereof in Scriptures, as Gregory in his dialogue inſerteth that of Matt. 12. This ſinne ſhall*

(1) *In fidei ſuæ elucidatione & ſerm. de Exequijs & ſuffragijs defunctorum & adc. 3. 18. 1. Ioan.*
(2) *Tom. 2. operum Huſſi. f. 82.*
(3) *In profeſſione fidei, c. 23.*
(4) *In aſſert. art. 17.*
(5) *Tom. 2. Wittemberg. 1545. in reſolutionibus de indulg. concluſione 15 fol. 111. prope fin. & concl. 16. 17. 19.*
(6) *Ibid. fol. 112. b. initio.*
(7) *Aduerſus Bullam. Tom. 7. fol. 112.*
(8) *Diſp. Lipſ. c. de Purg.*
(9) *In Diſput. Lyſtr.*

shall not be forgiuen, neither in this world, nor in the world to come. And I admit that of 2. Machab. 12. It is a holy and wholsome thought to pray for the dead. So fully doth Luther beliue, and teach Purgatory, euen from Scriptures themselues.

Vrbanus (10) Regius, fellow-labourer with Luther, alloweth prayer for the sinnes of the dead; and in proofe therof alleadgeth the practise of the *Ancient Church*, (11) *and testimonies of Nazianzen, Nyssen, Chrysostome, Ambrose, Austine, Damascene &c.* He also thinketh that, *Baruch* (12) *prayed for the dead*: and yet further alleadgeth his owne iudgment and Luthers, saying, (13) *The man of God Martin Luther, our for euer reuerend maister, thinketh it agreable with Christian piety, that of our free deuotion we should pray for our deceased friends.*

M. Fox acknowledgeth, that M. Latimer (14) acknowledged *Purgatory*. And William Thorpe a constant Professour, *prayed for his Fathers* (15) *and mothers soules*. Melanchon confesseth, that, (16) *Epiphanius testifyeth, Arius to haue thought that prayers for the dead are vnprofitable: that he reprehendeth, neither do we defend Arius.*

Sundry Prot. through euidence of truth, not daring absolutely to deny Purgatory and prayer for the dead, do yet speake thus doubtfully and inconsequently therof: (17) *It is lawfull to wish for the dead all quiet and happines in Christ, but it is not lawfull to pray for them.* Luther thinketh, (18) that it is lawfull sometymes to pray for the dead, but not often: also to pray for them at home, and in our Chamber, but not in the Church. And the same is taught by Vrbanus Regius (19). D. Field (20) is of opinion, that it is lawfull to pray for the dead presently after death, but not afterwards. Zwinglius sayth of himselfe, (21) *If one carefull for the dead, doth implore or beseech fauour for them from God, I do not condemne him: but it is Diabolicall to determine the tyme for this.* M. Ant. de Dominis thinketh that, (22) *At the Intercession of the Church, God doth remit lesser sinnes a litle after death, but not long after death.* But these are capriches raigning in the braines of men distracted, vnworthy of Confutation. And we haue here seene, that other Prot. without all exceptions, haue taught the Doctrine of Purgatory and prayer for the dead, euen from the Scripture

cum Ecchio c. de Purgat.

(10) 1. Part. operum in formula caute loquendi. fol. 86. & loc. com. c. 19.

(11) Loc. com. c. 18. de Purg. & part. 2. de Missæ negotio fol. 72.

(12) Loc. com. impress. 1545. de Sanctis n. 16. f. 224.

(13) in 1 part. operum in formula caute loquendi. c. de Sanctorum cultu.

(14) Act. mon. p. 1313. & p. 1315.

(15) Act. mon. p. 149.

(16) Apol. Confess. Augustanæ in Disput. de vocabulis Missæ.

(17) Confess. Wittemberg.

(18) Postil. in Dom. 2. post Trin. fol. 286. & in

ptures and practiſe of the Primitiue Church.

SECT. V.

Obiections from Scriptures againſt Purgatory and Prayer for the Dead, anſwered.

THe firſt Obiection is taken from thoſe words of the Pſalmiſt, (1) *When he ſhall giue ſleepe to his beloued, behould the Inheritance of our Lord.* Hence our Aduerſaries would proue, that immediatly after death the inheritance of Heauen followeth. To this I anſwere with S. Auſtine, (2) this place is meant of the general Reſurrection, *Dat ergo dans &c.* ſayth he, *God therfore beſtoweth this when his beloued ſhall ſleepe: then his beloued, to wit, of Chriſt ſhall aryſe. for all ſhall aryſe, but not as his beloued, for there is Reſurrection of all.* And then citing that place of the Apoſtle, (*we ſhall all indeed aryſe, but we ſhall not all be changed*) he addeth, *they do aryſe to torment, we aryſe as our Sauiour aroſe, that we may follow our Head, if we be his Members.* So that this place is meant, in S. Auſtine his Iudgment, of the Generall Reſurrection, after which the Elect go preſently to heauen, and are to expect no Purgatory. Beſides where Proteſtants (3) tranſlate the ſame words thus, *behould Children are the Inheritance of the Lord, and the fruite of the wombe his reward:* this place is altogeather impertinent, & making nothing at all againſt Purgatory.

Secondly, that of Eccleſiaſticus is obiected, (4) *Whatſoeuer thy hand is able to do, worke it inſtantly: for neither worke, nor reaſon, nor wiſdome, nor knowledge, ſhalbe in Hell.* Anſwere. S. Hierome (5) affirmeth Salomon to ſpeake this, in the perſon of the wicked, who take away both Purgatory & Hell, thinking no life to remayne after this: his wordes are, *Now he* (meaning the Preacher) *inducath as it were the humane Error and Cuſtome, wherby they exhort eche other to enioy the goods of this lyfe, and making a Proſopopeia, after the manner of Poets and Rhetoricians, ſay: O man becauſe then after death thou art nothing, and death it ſelfe is nothing, beare my Counſaile; and whileſt thou liueſt in this*

die omnium Sanctorum. fol. 442.

(19) *In form. cauſa loquendi. tom. 2. fol. 86.*

(20) Of the Church. l. 3. c. 17.

(21) *In Art. 60.*

(22) *De Rep. pub. l. 5. c. 8. n. 332.*

(1) *Pſ. 126. 3.*

(2) *In Pſ. 126. circa med.*

(1) Engl. Bible of Anno 1592.

(4) C. 9. 10.

(5) *In Comment. huius loci,*

short lyfe, enioy thy pleasure &c. Secondly the same S. Hiesome thinketh, that Salomon may speake this to those, who liuing wickedly, went directly to Hell, where it is most true, that there is no Comfort for them, and therfore concludeth thus of them, *As* (6) *fishes are taken with the hooke and nets, and birdes flying at liberty through the ayre, are ensnared at vnawares, so also men according to their desert, shalbe brought to Eternall torments &c.* Thirdly, this Text may also be applyed to those in Purgatory, for such only are holpen by the Prayers of their liuing friends, who by their good workes in their lyfe tyme, deserued the same, and therfore euery one had need to worke instantly in this lyfe. And thus it is expounded also by S. Gregory (7).

(6) Ibid.

(7) L. 4. Dial. c. 39.

Thirdly, some obiect that of Ecclesiastes, (8) *If the tree shall fall to the South, or to the North, in what place soeuer it shall fall, there shall it be:* therfore there is no Purgatory out of which it may be taken. Answere. Literally this is spoken of Corporall death, that men are necessarily to dye, and being dead, they can no more ryse by themselues, then the tree that falleth: But if we will apply this to the Condition of the Soule, then the meaning only is that, in what state or condition soeuer, be it of Saluation or Damnation, that a man departeth out of this lyfe, in the same State shall he euer remayne, fall the wood to the South, that is, dy the man in state of Saluation, or fall it to the North, that is, dye he in state of damnation: In what place it falleth, there it shall be, that is, his Condition shall neuer be changed: for neither if he depart in grace, shall he be able any more to loose it, neither if he dye out of the state of Grace shall he be euer able hereafter to recouer it, or to royse himselfe vnto it, as the tree being fallen, cannot aryse vp it selfe. Now he who is in Purgatory, is fallen to the South, because he dyed in state of Saluation, and therfore after due purging shall goe to Heauen. Nothing therfore can be inforced out of this place against Purgatory, since it belongeth to the South. Lastly this place of Ecclesiastes, maketh no more against Purgatory, then against *Limbus Patrum*, which was the place where the Fathers were before Christes Incarnation and death.

(8) 11.3.

Fourthly

Fourthly, others do vrge those wordes of the Apostle, (9) *For we must all be manifested before the Iudgment Seat of Christ, that euery one may receyue the proper thinges of the body, according as he hath done, either good or euill*, by which it may seeme that Purgatory is quite taken away. S. Austine giueth the answere vnto this Text, thus, (10) *But the tyme interposed betwixt mans death, and the last Resurrection, doth keepe the soules in secret Receptacles, as euery soule is worthy either of ease or misery, according as the soule hath wrought liuing in flesh: neither is it to be denyed, that the soules of the Dead are relieued with the piety of their liuing friends, when the Sacrifice of the Mediatour is offered for them, or Almes giuen in the Church. But those thinges profite them, who liuing merited, that these thinges might afterwards profite them: for there is a certayne manner of liuing, neither altogether so good, that it may not require these helpes after death, nor altogether so bad, that these things may not helpe it after death. But some kind of liuing is so good, that it needeth not these helpes, and againe, another so euill, that it cannot be holpen with these after this lyfe; wherefore here all the merit is to be got, whereby any may be relieued, or payned after this lyfe &c. These things therefore which the Church frequenteth for the Commending of the Dead, are not against that saying of the Apostle; WE shall all stand &c. because yet indeed merited liue for himselfe whilest he liued, that these thinges might auayle him; for these things do not profit all, and whyche they not profit all? But for the differences of lyfe which euery one held in flesh, that foreuse when Sacrifices either of the Aultar, or of what Almes soeuer are offered for all the dead baptized; for those who are very good, they are thanks-giuings, for those which are not very euill they are propitiations, for those which are very euill; although they are no relaxe of such dead, yet are they some Consolations to the liuing.* So fat S. Austine, both in proofe of Purgatory, and Sacrifice and prayer for the dead, and for full answere to this Obiection.

(9) 2. Cor. 5. 10.

(10) *In Enchyr. ad Laurentium. c. 110. & l. de Cura pro Mort. c. 1. Dionysius de Eccles. Hier. c. 7. S. Greg. l. 4. Dial. c. 39.*

Fiftly those wordes of S. Iohn are commonly obiected, (11) *Blessed are the dead which dye in our Lord, from henceforth now, saith the spirit, that they rest from their labours, for their workes follow them.* But all the Godly dye in our Lord, therefore there is no Purgatory for them. Answere. S. Anselme, (12) by these wordes, *from henceforth*, vnderstandeth the day of Iudgment,

(11) *Apoc. 14. 13.*

(12) *In Comment. huius loci.*

ment, wherof S. Iohn ſpeaketh in all that Chapter, and ſo it maketh nothing againſt Purgatory, which then ſhall ceaſe. Victor (13) and *Haymo* expound this place to be meãt of very perfect men, and eſpecially of holy Martyres, whom S. Iohn in this place is willed to comfort, and who are ſaid abſolutly *to dye in our Lord*, not hauing any thing after death to be purged: wheras thoſe who dye in veniall ſinne, or with puniſhment to be paid for mortall, dye not abſolutly in our Lord, but partly ſo, by reaſon of their Charity, and partly otherwiſe, by reaſon of their ſinne, and ſo they are called by S. Auſtine, (14) partly the ſonnes of God, and partly the ſonnes of the world.

(13) *In hunc locum.*

(14) *L. 3. contr. duas Ep. Pelag. c. 3.*

A ſixt Obiection is taken from that Promiſe Chriſt made to the Thiefe cõuerted at his death; S. Luke recordeth it thus, (16) *This day thou ſhalt be with me in Paradiſe*: therfore no Purgatory remayneth, no not for thoſe who haue done no Pennance. The anſwere is: A death ſo cruel, ſuffered ſo patiently, and a Confeſſion of Chriſt ſo admirable, euen then, when the Apoſtles themſelues denied him, might well be taken for a full ſatisfaction: neither do the Priuiledges of a few, make a Law; but beſides, ſeeing the good Thiefe ready to dye, deſired our Lord that *he would remember him when he came into his kingdome*; it ſtrongly argueth that the Thiefe thought, that immediatly after death, he was not to go to heauen, otherwiſe he would haue prayed him to haue taken him with him to his kingdome, and yet withall, he hoped not to be damned; wherupon it followeth, that he thought there was ſome other place beſides heauen, and hell, where he was to remayne for a tyme, vntill Chriſt, comming to his kingdome, ſhould remember to take him thence, which was the vttermoſt which the good Thiefe could hope for.

(16) *C. 23. 43.*

Brentius obiecteth, that all are included within theſe words, *Come ye bleſſed &c. and go ye accurſed &c.* Anſwere. The words precedent and ſubſequent, do manifeſtly ſhow, that this is ſpoken of the day of Iudgment, when Purgatory ſhall ceaſe.

Some argue thus: In Purgatory a man cannot merit, therfore

therfore neither ſatisfy. But for anſwere, I may truly ſay that the Conſequence is falſe, for to merit, beſydes Grace is required liberty, and the ſtate of this lyfe, wheras a man may truly ſatisfy, though he be compelled therunto by the Iudge.

Laſtly M. Rogers thinketh that, (17) *In the ſacred Scripture there is mention but only of two wayes, one leading vnto deſtruction, the other bringing vnto lyfe, of two ſortes of men, wherof ſome beleeue, and they are ſaued, ſome beleeue not, and they are damned: And of two ſtates, one bleſſed, where Lazarus is, the other curſed, where Dives doth abyde. A third way, or ſort, or ſtate, cannot be found in the word of God.* Anſw. It is true, that wayes, ſtates, and ſortes of men, in regard of Eternity, are but two, but this nothing hindreth but that temporally, and before the day of Iudgment come, there may be more, as hath bene proued formerly from the Scriptures themſelues, the Ancient Fathers, and ſundry Proteſtant writers.

(17) Def. of the Art art. 22. p. 119.

CHAP. XVI.

The true ſtate of the Queſtion, concerning the Interceſſion, and Inuocation of Angels, and Saintes.

Whether the Angels and Saintes in Heauen, do pray for men vpon Earth; And whether we may lawfully pray to them as Interceſſors to God for vs: Or whether the ſaid Angels and Saintes do heare our Prayers, or know things done vpon Earth: and their Interceſsion be not a derogation from Chriſtes Mediation.

SECT. I.

Catholike Doctrine.

ALTHOVGH it be the ordinary practiſe of Prot. to endeauour the priuation of all honour to Angels and Saintes from men vpon Earth, and to hinder men from the help of their ſuffrages; yet the Church of Chriſt to the contrary hath euer exhibited vnto them their due honour, and hath made vſe of their holy prayers. So the Church of Chriſt commandeth, (1) *all Biſhops and others ſuſtayning the Office and charge of teaching, that according to the vſe of the Catholicke and apoſtolicke Church, receyued from the very*

(1) Conc. Trid. Seſſ. 25. Decret. de interceſsione Sanctorum.

very first tyme of Christian Religion, and according to the consent of holy Fathers, and the Decrees of sacred Councels, they first of all diligently teach the faithfull concerning the intercession and invocation of Saintes &c. teaching them that the Saintes raigning togeather with Christ, do offer their prayers to God for men; that it is good and profitable humbly to invocate them, and to fly to their prayers, helpe, and ayd for the obtayning of benefits from God by his Sonne Iesus Christ our Lord, who is our only Redeemer and Saviour: And that those who deny, that Saintes enioying eternall felicity in heaven are to be invocated, or such as do affirme, either that they do not pray for men, or that by invocation of them, they pray not for vs in particular, is Idolatry or against Gods word, or opposite to the honour of one Mediatour of God & man, Iesus Christ, or that it is foolish either by word or thought to supplicate the Saintes raigning in heaven, are of wicked opinion. Thus the Councell of Trent.

The Fathers of the Councell of Chalcedon pray thus, (2) *Flavian lieth after death, the Martyr pray for vs.* The Councell of Constantinople decreeth, (3) *that a Christian adoring only God his Creator, may invocate Saintes, that they would vouchsafe to pray for him to the diuine Majesty.* And the Bishops in the Councell of Cabilonense make this prayer to S. Vincent, (4) *Being assembled togeather in the Church of S. Vincent, asking the Intercession of this holy Martyr, that we may deserue by his suffrage the long lyfe of the forsaid Prince.* The second Councell of Nice aduiseth thus (5) *Let vs do all things with the feare of God, asking the intercessions of the vnspotted Mother of God, & alwayes Virgin Mary, also of the Angels, & all Saintes.*

(2) *Flavian lieth after death, the Martyr pray for vs.* The Councell of Constantinople decreeth, (3) *that a Christian adoring only God his Creator, may invocate Saintes, that they would vouchsafe to pray for him to the diuine Majesty.* And the Bishops in the Councell of Cabilonense make this prayer to S. Vincent, (4) *Being assembled togeather in the Church of S. Vincent, asking the Intercession of this holy Martyr, that we may deserue by his suffrage the long lyfe of the forsaid Prince.* The second Councell of Nice aduiseth thus (5) *Let vs do all things with the feare of God, asking the intercessions of the vnspotted Mother of God, & alwayes Virgin Mary, also of the Angels, & all Saintes.*

(1) *Act* 11.
(3) *Conc. 6. Constantinop. c.* 7. See *Conc. Gangrense can.* 20.
(4) *Can.* 11
(5) *Act.* 6. & *Act.* 3.

Agreably to these Councels the present Church (6) of Christ teacheth, that although it be not lawfull to pray to Angels or Saintes, as the authors and giuers either of Grace or glory, or of any thing requisite to saluation; or as though they were our so immediate intercessors to God, as to aske any thing without Christes mediation, and his merits; yet that they do pray for vs both in generall and particular, & that we may pray to them, all Catholikes beleeue.

(6) *Bellar. de Sanct. l.* 1. c. 17 *&c. Rhem Test. in Luc.* 16. 9. & *in* 1. *Pet.* 1. 13.

Pointes Diſputable.

(7) *Auguſt. l. de cura pro mort. c. 15.*
(8) *S. Hieron. cont. Vigil.*
(9) *Aug. l. de cura pro mort. cap 15.*
(10) *S. Greg. l. 11. Moral. c. 13. S. Tho. 3. part q. 10. art. 2.*

Some (7) Catholicke writers teach that the Saintes in heauen do know thinges vpon earth by the relation of Angels. (8) Others, that by the celerity of their nature, they are as it were, euery where, and do heare by themſelues the prayers of their ſuppliants. (9) Others yet, that our prayers when we make them, are reuealed to them by God. But (10) others moſt probably, that from the very beginning of their beatitude, they do ſee all things in God, which in any reſpect do belong vnto them, and therfore our prayers, directed vnto them.

Proteſtant Vntruthes.

(11) *Ad Euangelium de feſto Annunciationis.*
(12) *De neceſſitate reformandæ Eccleſiæ.*
(13) *Inſtit. l. 3. c. 10. §. 22.*
(14) *Ib. l. 3. c. 20. §. 21.*
(15) *Confeſsio Manſfeldenſium cap. de erroribus Ieſuitarum.*
(16) Way to the Church, Pref. to the Read. n. 14.
(17) Def. of the Art. art. 22. p. 128.

Luther affirmeth, that, (11) *The Papiſtes make the Virgin Mary a God, they attribute vnto her omnipotency in heauen and in earth &c. In the Papacy all haue betaken themſelues to Mary, and haue expected more fauour and grace from her, then from Chriſt himſelfe.* According to Caluin, (12) *We do not only adore Saintes inſtead of Chriſt, but alſo their bones, garments, ſhooes and pictures.* And, (13) *euery one takes to themſelues peculiar Saintes, into whoſe cuſtody they giue themſelues, no otherwiſe then if they were guardian Gods.* Yea he auoucheth, (14) that *in our Hymnes and Lytanies* we make no mention of Chriſt. Other Prot. auouch, that, (15) *The error of the Ieſuiticall ſect is, that Chriſt although he was our Mediatour, and interceſſor, yet now he is not any more, but Saints only are our Interceſſours, and mediatours.* D. White ſpeaking of Catholike Paſtours ſayth, (16) *In their open ſeruice and printed bookes (they) ſerue the Saints and worship them, with the ſame ſeruice that they giue to Chriſt.* Agayne, *The ſame titles are giuen to the Saints, and the ſame things, by the ſame merits asked of them, that appertaine to Chriſt alone.* And, *they ioyne the Virgin Mary with Chriſt in the very works of our Redemption, & aſcribe to her no leſſe then to him, the execution of all Gods mercyes towards vs.*

Rogers affirmeth that, (17) *All Gods people in the purer and former tymes haue &c vtterly condemned the inuocating or paying vnto creatures whatſoeuer.* But theſe & ſundry ſuch like vntruths broached

broached by Prot. deſerue no other anſwere, but truly to ſay, that they are lyes vttered by the legitimate children of the father of lyes, the Diuell.

Proteſtant Doctrine.

The Engliſh Prot. Church decreeth that, (18) *The Romiſh doctrine touching inuocation of Saints &c. is a fond thing, vainly inuented, and grounded vpon no warrant of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the word of God.* The French Huguenots ſay, (19) *We beleeue that whatſoeuer men do imagine concerning the Interceſſion of Saints departed, is nothing elſe then fraud and fallacies of Sathan.* Whitaker ſayth of himſelfe and other Prot. (20) *We do not know whether Martyrs and Saints may pray to Chriſt for vs:* But (21) *It is certayne, that they are ignorant what we do.*

Daneus proceedeth yet further, affirming that (22) *It is a falſe propoſition, that the Saints who are already receyued into heauen, do pray God in generall for vs who liue heere.* And againe, (23) *They do not aske any thing of God either in generall or particular for the neceſſities of men liuing vpon Earth.* And the like is taught by ſundry other Proteſtants. Sundry Prot. likewiſe teach, that the Saints in Heauen do not take any care of vs vpon Earth, neyther do know our Prayers, or other things heere done. Caluin teacheth, that, (24) *We know the offices of Charity are reſtrayned to the courſe of this preſent lyfe.* And, (25) *The Papiſtes are beer foolish ſubtill, whileſt they will proue that the dead haue care of the liuing, then which cauill nothing is more vnſauory.* Beza admireth, (26) *Who ſhall rightly perſuade himſelfe or others, that the ſoules of Saints receyued into Heauen, do take care of theſe things which are done vpon Earth, or that they are knowne; much leſſe that they ought to be inuocated.* But how rightly theſe Prot. agree with ancient Heretickes, obſerue.

Proteſtants agree with Ancient Hereticks.

D. Fulke confeſſeth, that (27) *Vigilantius writ againſt Inuocation of Saints &c. him Hierome reproueth.* And the ſame is confeſſed of Vigilantius by other (28) Prot. D. Humfrey ſayth, (29) *Vigilantius ordayned, that Saints were not to be worshipped*

(18) Article 22.
(19) *Confeſſ. Gallart. 14.*
(20) *Adrat. 4. Camp. p. 18.* See Perkins tom. 1. c. 21. in ſerie cauſarum. col. 11. Reinolds in his Conference, c. 1. ſect. 2.
(21) *Ad rat. 4. Camp.*
(22) *Contreu. 7. p. 1310.*
(23) *Ib. p. 1315. Polanus Diſp. 35. Cal. Inſtit. l. 3. c. 20. § 21.*
(24) *In Zachar. 1. 12.*
(25) *In Luc. 16. 19.*
(26) *In Luc. 15. 10.*
(27) Anſwer to a Counterf. Cath. p. 40. Hieron. cont. Vigil. c. 3.
(28) Parker ag. Symboliz. part. 1. p. 74. 83. Criſpinus eſtate of the Church. p. 131.

(29) Ad rat. 3. Camp. p. 29.

ped &c. we ordayne the same. And so you ranke your false M. Humfrey to be an hereticke with Vigilantius.

In like sort, Sarauia and others acknowledge, that Arius was also condemned by the Fathers for his then teaching that, (30) *The Saints departed are not to be prayed vnto*. And the same heresy is taught by (31) Mahomet.

(30) Defens. Tract. de diuersis. p. 349. 346. Bucanus loc. com. p. 514.

(31) Azoara 49.

Vigilantius (32) and the Waldenses (33) denyed that Saints could heare vs: and so did D. Whitakers and others next before; but they are all censured by S. Hierome, and Guido, of Heresy.

(32) Hier. cont. Vigil. c. 3.

(33) Guido de Waldensibus.

Protestant Errours.

Caluin thinketh, it (34) *foolish and temerarious to seeke in what place the soules of the iust are, whether they enioy glory or no. In the meane time foreseeing the Scripture euery where commandeth to depend of the expectation of Christes comming, and differreth the glory and Crowne till then, let vs be content with those limits prescribed by God, the soules of the godly hauing performed the labour of warfare to sit together in blessed rest, where with happy ioy they expect the fruition of promised glory:* here Caluin contradicteth himselfe, first censuring it for foolish, to enquire after the state of the soules of the iust departed, and yet himselfe afterwards determineth the matter, and that most wickedly, by denying present glory to the soules of Saintes. Perkins acknowledgeth that, (35) *when Angels did appeare, they were lawfully honored, but not now.*

(34) Instit. l. 4. c. 23. §. 6.

(35) Reform. Cath. controu. 14. c. 2.

Where Catholikes do call the blessed *Virgin Mary*, our B. *Lady*, M. Rogers affirmeth (36) *that we falsly call her so*: It seemes he would haue no greater title giuen vnto her, then *Mistres Mary*, which any Minister expecteth to be giuen to his wyfe. Caluin affirmed (as before) *that* (37) *we know the office of Charity to be restrayned to the course of this present lyfe*. So that according to him, there is no exercise of Charity in heauen.

(36) Def. of the Art. art. 20. p. 106.

(37) In Ezechiel. c. 22.

Tindall demaundeth, (38) *To what end dost thou erect Churches in honour of Saintes, that thou shouldest make them thy friends? they need it not, yea they are not thy friends*. Moste agreable with

(38) In Fox Act. Mon. p. 1137.

t hat

that of Luther, (39) *Neither are they thy friends, but the friends of them from whom in their tyme they receiued benefit.* We must not according to Luther imitate Saintes, (40) *These trifles ought not to be preached to men, that they imitate Saintes and tread in their steppes.* (41) *A long error hath possessed and preuayled, that we should all consider the workes and conuersation of Saints, and study to follow them, we fooles thinking this to be greatest piety.* And the like is taught by Caluin. And their counsaile is diligently obserued by all their followers.

(39) *Postil. in Dom. 9. post Trin. fol. 309.*
(40) *Postil. in fest. Sancti Ioannis. fol. 178.*
(41) *In seriis institum fol. 91. Calu. in Io. 4. 20.*

SECT. II.

It is proued by Scriptures, that the Angels, and Saints in Heauen do know our prayers vpon Earth, and that they pray for vs, and we may lawfully pray vnto them, as Intercessours for vs.

SEeing nothing is more frequent in the mouthes of late Sectaries, than that praying to Saints is no where taught in the Scriptures; I will therfore endeauour to proue from thence three points, all necessarily belonging to this Question. The first is, that Angells and Saints do heare our Prayers & know things that are done vpon Earth; the second, that they pray for vs not only in generall, but also in particular. And the third is, that we may lawfully pray to them. The first shalbe proued from the Prophecy of holy Daniel, where it is sayd, (1) *And he (to wit the Angell) sayd to me, feare not Daniel; Because from the first day that thou didest set thy hart to vnderstand, to afflict thy selfe in the sight of God, thy words haue been heard, and I am come for thy words.* Now by the words of Daniel, no man doubteth but are vnderstood his prayers, which were both heard and knowne by the Angell, since the Angell giueth the hearing of his prayers to be cause of his comming vnto him. So that Daniel praying vpon Earth, was heard by the Angell in heauen.

(1) C. 10. 12.

Secondly this point is proued by these wordes of Saint Paul, (2) *Whether Prophecyes shalbe made void, or tongues shall cease,*

(1) 1. Cor. 13. 8. 9. 10. 12.

ceaſe, or knowledge ſhalbe deſtroyed: for in part we know, and in part we propheſy; but when that ſhall come that is perfect, that ſhalbe made voyd, that is in part: we ſee now by a glaſſe in a darke ſort; but then face to face: now I know in part; but then I ſhall know, as alſo I am knowne. The neceſſary deduction out of this place is this, that the knowledge of the Bleſſed, farre exceedeth any ſupernaturall knowledge, whether of Fayth or Prophecy giuen to man in this lyfe, in ſo much, as whatſoeuer is knowne by any knowledge of this lyfe, is much more perfectly knowne by that knowledge of the bleſſed. Now it is moſt certaine that many Prophets and holy men vpon Earth, knew the thoughts of other mens harts, and things far diſtant from them, as is made manifeſt by the Prophet Eliſeus, when he demanded Giezi (3) *Was not my hart preſent, when the man returned out of his Chariot to meet thee?* Yea he diſcouered vnto him further, all the particulers of his *brybery*, togeather with the end, and cauſe which moued him, which muſt needs argue, that he was priuy to his very inward & ſecreteſt thoughts: againe, was not the ſame Prophet priuy to all the ambuſhments that the King of Syria layd to entrap the King of Iſrael? & did he not by Propheticall forſight, premoniſh the King of Iſrael thereof, ſaying, (4) *Beware thou paſſe not into ſuch a place, becauſe the Syrians are there in ambuſhments.* And the King of Iſrael following the counſell of the Prophet, preuented him of the ambuſh: and when the King of Syria ſuſpected ſome of his owne to betray his Counſaile vnto the King of Iſrael, did not one of his Counſaylors reply? (5) *Not ſo my Lord King, but Eliſeus the Prophet, which is in Iſrael, telleth the King of Iſrael all words, whatſoeuer thou ſhalt ſpeake in thy priuy Chamber.* Which point of liuing Prophets knowing mens thoughts and wordes, though neuer ſo ſecret, and diſtant, was ſo euident, that the very Infidels themſelues acknowledged it; and yet our Aduerſaries pretending themſelues to be Chriſtians, and Reformers, will not grant this Priuiledge to the Angells, and Saints triumphing, and raigning in heauen.

(1) 4. Reg. 5. 26.

(4) 4. Reg. 6. 9. See the like Act. 5. 3, 9.

(5) *Ibid. verſ.* 12. And ſee Act 5. 1. 2. &c. S. Peters knowing the fraudulent dealing of Ananias and Saphira.

Thirdly, it is generally houlden that the damned Spirits in hell do know things done vpon Earth; and ſhall we deny

deny the like knowledge to the Saintes in heauen? Daneus sayth, (6) *The deuils do excell with admirable knowledge of these temporall and earthly things.* And experience is strong herein, as appeareth by many Examples, namely of the spirit *Orthon* mentioned by Froyzard, and of possessed children, which in their fits, tell of things done in their absence: In so much as that the Deuils from this their knowledge of things done, did probably coniecture such things to come as were therupon depending, as appeareth by their so many Oracles. Yea this point is so true, that Aretius (7) proueth the same by sundry Examples of the Scriptures. Did not Abraham after his death, and yet not in heauen, know that Moyses & the Prophets were teaching vpon Earth, when he said, (8) *They haue Moyses and the Prophets, let them heare them.* Yea the damned Diues (9) was not ignorant that he had *fiue Brethren alyue.* Now then if wicked spirits and damned Deuils are not ignorant of things done vpon Earth, shall not the blessed Angels and glorifyed Saintes, who are not inferiour in knowledge, much the rather vnderstand & know the same?

(6) Christian. Isagog. part. 2. c. 33. p. 83.

(7) *Loc. com.* p. 546. 548.

(8) *Luc.* 16. 29.

(9) *Ibid. ver.* 27. 28.

Thirdly this point is proued by those words of our Sauiour mentioned by S. Luke, (10) *there shall be ioy before the Angels of God vpon one sinner that doth penance.* Now none can reioyce, but such as know, what the thing is at which they reioyce: but the Angels reioyce at the conuersion of a sinner vpon Earth; therfore it followeth euidently, that they know of the Conuersion of sinners vpon earth, that being the cause of their Ioy.

(10) 15. 10.

Fourthly the same may be proued from such places as show that we haue Angels to guard vs, as that of S. Mathew, (11) *See that you despise not one of these litles ones, for I say to you, that their Angels in heauen, alwayes do see the face of my Father* Here amongst other reasons, it is vrged, that we should take heed of despising or scandalizing others, because their Angels seeing God, see the same. And when S. Peter (12) deliuered out of Prison, knocked at the doore where many of the faithfull were assembled, it is said, at the first they would not beleiue, that it was he, *but his Angel.* The like knowledge

(11) 18. 10.

(12) *Act.* 12. 14. 15. 16.

of Angels might be proued from K. Dauid, saying, (13) *In the sight of Angels I will sing to thee.* And from S. Paul, (14) *we are made a spectacle to the world, and to Angels, and to men.* Which words plainly import that Angels do looke vpon vs.

(13) Ps. 137. 2.
(14) 1. Cor. 4. 9.

But some do reply and say, though it be granted, that Angels do know things vpon earth, yet it followeth not that the blessed soules do the like. But this forceth nothing: for first, that granted to Angels that they know things vpon Earth, then it euidently followeth, that they knowing our necessities, do in their Charity pray for vs, and that we may lawfully pray to them. Secondly of Saintes it is said, that (15) *they are as heauenly Angels*, and in another place, (16) *equall to Angels*, and yet in a third place, there is said to be in heauen, (17) *The measure of a man, which is of an Angell.* All which argueth, that the Saintes in heauen may enioy equall glory with the Angels. Besides they are indued with their vnderstanding, glorifyed, and eleuated with the light of glory, & with the presence and true sight of God, as the Angels are, and therfore nothing is wanting to them herein, which is granted to the Angels. And they haue this more then Angels, that they are members of the body of the Church, more conioyned with vs, then the Angels, and haue experienced our miseries and dangers.

(15) Mat. 22. 30.
(16) Luc. 20. 36.
(17) Apoc. 21. 17.

Caluin confesseth this argument to conuince, if we can proue, that as the Angels haue charge of men, and do guard them, & are present at their affayres, so the blessed soules of men do the like. But this is easily proued by these texts following, (18) *He that shall ouercome, and keepe my workes vnto the end, I will giue him power ouer the Nations, and he shall rule them with a rod of Iron, and as the vessel of a Potter shall they be broken, as I also haue receyued of my Father.* (19) *He that shall ouercome, I will make him a Pillar in the temple of my God.* (20) *Blessed is that seruant, whom when his Lord cometh, he shal fynd so doing: Amen. I say to you, that ouer all his goods he shall appoint him.* Here we haue that the soules of Blessed men after their death, and before the Resurrection, receiue power ouer Countryes, to gouerne and feed them, and to be pillars to support the Church, & to haue care ouer *Gods goods*, which S. Hilary sayth, *is his*

(18) Apoc. 2. 26. 27.
(19) Apoc. 3. 12.
(20) Mat. 24. 46. 47.

Church:

Church: all which ſhow, that they haue to do with our affayres in this world. *The guardes of Saintes* (ſaith (21) S. Hilary) *and the defence of Angels, are not wanting to thoſe that will ſtand.* S. Ambroſe alſo teacheth, that (22) *As the Angels haue charge, ſo alſo theſe who haue deſerued the lyfe of Angels.* And S. Leo auoucheth, that *S. Peter* (23) *now more fully and powerfully performeth thoſe things which are committed vnto him, and executeth all the parts of offices and cares, in him by whom he is glorifyed.* So cleere it is that the B. Soules, do take care, and help our affaires in this world.

(21) *In pſal.* 124.
(22) *L. 8. in Lucam fine.*
(23) *Serm. 2. de Anniuerſario ſuæ Aſſumpt.*

The ſame is proued from the very ſtate of their beatitude, for their appetite is ſo fully ſatisfyed, as that nothing is wanting vnto them, which otherwiſe naturally they could deſire, agreeing with that of the Pſalmiſt, (24) *I ſhalbe ſatisfyed when thy glory ſhall appeare*; as alſo with that of S. Iohn, (25) *Aske and you ſhall receyue, that your ioy may be full.* But it is vndoubted, that they naturally deſire to know the ſtate of their brethren, friends, benefactours, wyfe, or Children, and the like left behind them vpon Earth, therefore the Saintes in heauen know the affaires, much more the prayers of their friends vpon Earth, otherwiſe they could not be ſatisfyed in their glory, and their ioy made full.

(24) *Pſ.* 16. 15.
(25) *C.* 16. 25.

¶ Now followeth the ſecond part of this Section, viz. That Angells & Saints pray for vs. And firſt we read in the Prophet Zachary, that the Angell prayed for the people, (26) *And the Angell of our Lord anſwered and ſayd: O Lord of Hoſtes how long wilt thou not haue mercy on Hieruſalem, and on the Cities of Iuda, with which thou haſt beene angry? This is now the 70. yeare.* Heere the Angell prayeth in particular for Hieruſalem, and the Cities of Iuda.

(26) *C.* 1. 12.

Secondly, we read in the Booke of Tobias, that the Angell Raphaell ſayd to Tobias, (27) *When thou dideſt pray with teares, and dideſt bury the dead &c. I offered thy prayers to our Lord.* And againe, (28) *I am Raphael an Angell one of the ſeauen which aſſiſt before our Lord.* This place is ſo plaine for the Interceſſion of Angells, that in want of better anſwere, Whitaker ſayth, (29) *Little do we regard the example of Raphael the Angell mentioned in Toby, neither do we acknowledge thoſe ſeauen Angells*

(27) *C.* 12. 12.
(28) *C.* 12. 15.
(29) *Adrat. Camp. rat. 2. p.* 13.

gella whereof he speaketh: all this is different from the Canonicall Scripture, and sauoureth I know not of what superstition. But it seemeth Whitaker did not well remember, that mention is made of those 7. Angels, *Apoc.* 1. 4. and 5. 6. And that the booke of Toby is Canonicall Scripture, I haue proued before.

(30) 15. 12. 14.

Thirdly, it is recorded in the 2. booke of (30) Machabees, how *Iudas Machabeus saw in vision Onias stretching forth his hands, praying for all the people of the Iewes; & that Onias said of Hieremy, This is a louer of his brethren, who prayeth much for the people, & for al the holy Citty.* To this Whitaker only answereth, (31) *I let passe that dreame of Iudas concerning Onias, whereof we read 2. Mach. 15. But it litle skilleth whether then vnderstād intercession of the dead, or Sacrifice: both is false.* So that no other answere is left to these places, but only the deniall of the said bookes to be Canonicall Scripture, wheras the contrary is already proued at large.

(31) *Adrat. Camp. p. 16.*

Fourthly, Almighty God sayd vnto Hieremy, (32) *If Moyses and Samuell shall stand before me, my soule is not towards this people*; which argueth, that they were wont to stand before God, praying for others. Caluin answereth, that from this place rather the contrary is to be gathered, for seeing it is said, if they shall stand, to wit, to pray, it importeth that they neither stood, nor prayed. But though peraduenture it be signifyed, that as then they did not pray, because they vnderstood the matter then to be desperate, yet it is signifyed that at other times they were accustomed to pray, who they thought they might obtayne: for otherwise Gods speach had not beene apt & congruous. For if a man should say, If my horse should pray for thee, I will not graunt it, he should speake foolish, because horses cannot pray: and in like sort, if one should say, if Demosthenes shall come, he shall not persuade me, this speach also were foolish, because dead men do not vse to come. And the same, which God forbid, might be sayd of those words, *If Moyses and Samuel shall stand before me*, if they neyther could, nor were accustomed to pray. And it is to be noted, that it is not sayd, *If they should stand*, that is, if by impossibility they should now liue and pray, but, *if they shall stand*, which signifyeth what they might do, to wit, pray.

(32) Cap. 15. 1.

(33) *Apoc.* 5. 8.

Fifthly, S. Iohn relateth that, (33) *The 24. Elders fell down before*

before the Lambe having euery one of them harpes, and golden viells full of odours, which are the prayers of the Saints. These wordes cleerly teach, that the Saints in heauen offer vp the prayers of holy persons in Earth, (called heere, and in other places Saints) to Christ: and that these odours were prayers.

Sixtly, the Martyrs in heauen cry with a loud voyce, saying, (34) *How long Lord, holy and true, iudgest thou not, & reuengest not our blood of them that dwell vpon the Earth?* Now if they pray for reuenge of their enemies, much more for mercy and grace for their friends. This place is so conuincing, that Prot. vnderstand the same of such praiers as the Saints made when they were vpon Earth, not as they are in heauen. (35) *In the Apocalyps* (say they) *the soules of the Saints slayne, do cry out that their blood may be reuenged, not that now resting in the Lord, they are desirous of reuenge, according to the manner of men, but that the Lord euen after their death, is mynd full of the prayers, which whileſt they liued vpon Earth, they powred out for the deliuery of themselues and the whole Church.* But this is directly contrary to the words of the Text, which affirme, that they then in heauen did actually pray for reuenge. Beſydes, it is false and iniurious to Martyrs, to say, that whileſt they were liuing, they desired reuenge of their Persecutors, for they rather with Christ our Sauiour, and S. Steuen, prayed for their pardon: whileſt they were liuing, they were subiect to sinne, and so might haue bene in danger if they had asked reuenge, to haue done it vpon anger, hatred, and malice: Whereas now in heauen, according to S. Bedes expoſition, they do it in regard, and loue of Iuſtice.

(34) *Apoc. 6. 10.*

(35) *Confeſſ. Wittenberg. edit. in inuocatione Sanctorum.*

S. Peter promiſeth to pray for his flock after his death, saying, (36) *I thinke it meet as long as I am in this Tabernacle, to stir you vp by admonition, being certaine that the laying away of my Tabernacle is at hand, according as our Lord Ieſus Christ alſo ſignifyed vnto me: and I will do my diligence, you to haue often, after my deceaſe alſo, that you may keepe a memory of theſe things.* Now it is euident, that by the laying downe of his Tabernacle, he meaneth his death, as by being in his Tabernacle he vnderſtandeth the terme of his lyfe: & where he saith, that after the Depoſition of his Tabernacle or deceaſe, he will do his dili-

(36) *2. Ep. c. 1. v. 13. 14. 15.*

diligence to haue them often, what elſe can be meant, but that after his death, when he is in heauen, he will often haue them in mynd, and pray vnto God for them: ſignifying plainly that his care ouer them, ſhould not ceaſe by death, and that by his Interceſſion before God, after his departure, he would do the ſame thing for them, that he did before in his lyfe by teaching and preaching. And agreably to this, it was a common practiſe among ancient(37) Chriſtians of the Primitiue Church, and alwayes ſince among Catholickes, to make couenant in their life tyme, that whether of them went to heauen before the other, he ſhould pray for his friend yet liuing.

(37) See Euſeb. Hiſt. l. 6. c. 4. Cypr. Ep. 57. fin. & de Diſcipl. & habitu virginum Hier. Ep. 1. ad Heliod. c. 2.

D. Fulke for his beſt euaſion corrupteth the Text, for where it is ſaid, *I will do my diligence, you to haue often, after my deceaſe alſo, that you may keepe a memory of theſe things*, he tranſlateth it thus, (38) *I will euer alſo giue my diligence, that ye may haue wherwith to ſtir vp the remembrance of theſe things after my departing*; which ſaith he, (39) *he performeth in wryting this Epiſtle*: So making the Epiſtle to be that, which muſt ſtir vp the remembrance of thoſe things after his departing, wheras S. Peter ſpeaketh of himſelfe, that he will do his diligence, them to haue often after his deceaſe alſo.

(38) Against Rhem. Teſt. in 2. Pet. 1. 15.

(39) *Ibid.* p. 443.

Laſtly, the Scriptures plainly teach the Communion of the Church Triumphant, with the Militant, for ſo the Apoſtle ſaith, (40) *We are come &c. to the Church of the firſt borne, which are written in the heauens, and ſo are Citizens therof.* (41) *And Hieruſalem which is aboue &c is our Mother.* And, (42) *Chriſt is the head of the body, the Church.* Now this Communion doth neceſſarily require, that, all the Members of this body be carefull and helpfull one to another, this being the nature of members liuing vnder one Head, as the ſame (43) Apoſtle teacheth. And ſo S. Auſtine expreſly teacheth that, (44) *Neither are the ſoules of the godly departed ſeparated from the Church, which alſo now is the kingdome of Chriſt, for otherwiſe there ſhould not be Commemoration made of them at the Aultar of God, in the Communication of the body of Chriſt*: So certaine it is, that there is a holy Communion betwene the Saintes in Heauen, and the faithfull vpon Earth.

(40) Heb. 12. 22. 23.

(41) Gal. 4. 26.

(42) Col. 1. 18. Eph. 4. 15.

(43) Rom. 12. 4. 1. Cor. 12. 12.

(44) De Ciuit. Dei. l. 20. c. 9.

Hauing

Hauing thus declared already, that the Angels and Saintes know and heare our prayers, and further that they pray for vs; becauſe D. Fulke thinketh that, (45) *if it were proued, that the Saintes departed do pray for vs, yet haue we no warrant out of Scriptures to pray to them*: I will now in the reſidue of this Section, endeauour to proue from the Scriptures, that we may lawfully pray to them; which indeed neceſſarily followeth by force of Argument drawne from the premiſſes, thus. We may lawfully and profitably pray vnto them, who are able in reſpect of their power with God, fit for their knowledge of our Eſtates, and laſtly willing to pray for vs, in regard of their great and exceſſiue Charity: But the Saints and Angels haue power with God, & ſo are able, haue knowledge of our affaires, and therefore fit, are full of Charity, and therefore willing to pray for vs; Therfore we may, and do lawfully and profitably pray vnto them.

(45) Againſt Rhem. Teſt. in 2 Pet. 1. 15. p. 443.

But this is proued further by warrant of Scripture & manyfold examples therin contained: for firſt the Patriarch Iacob coming to bleſſe the children of his ſonne Ioſeph, Ephraim, and Manaſſes, inuocated the Angell thus, (46) *The Angell who hath deliuered me from all euill, bleſſe theſe Children*. To this ſome (47) Prot. anſwere, that by *Angell*, is vnderſtood *Chriſt*: which is impoſſible, ſeeing he was not incarnated for ſome thouſands of yeares after. The Prophet Oſee alſo ſaith of Iacob, (48) *He preuailed againſt the Angell and was ſtrengthned, he wept, and beſought him*. Heere the Prophet expreſſely affirmeth, that Iacob *beſought the Angell*, (49) or as ſome Prot, tranſlate, *he wept, and prayed vnto him*: ſo cleere it is, that Iacob prayed to the Angell. Moyſes deſiring to auert Gods heauy wrath greatly kindled againſt the Iſraelites, for their Idolatry of the goulden Calfe, cold light vpon no more effectuall meanes to ſtay Gods hand frō deſtroying them at once, then thus to pray, (50) *Remember Abraham, Iſaac, and Iſrael thy ſeruants &c.* which place doth virtually imply both inuocation of Saints, as alſo inuocation of God by the merits of his Saints, as we ſhall ſee when we come to the expoſition of the Fathers vpon theſe places. In the meane tyme obſerue that, the Iuſt who dyed before the coming of Chriſt, did not enter

(46) *Gen.* 48. 16.

(47) See the Marg. notes of the Engl. Bible of 1578.

(48) *Cap.* 12. 4.

(49) The Engliſh Bible of 1578.

(50) *Exod.* 32. 13.

enter into heauen, or see God, neither could they ordinarily know the prayer of the liuing; and therefore it was not vsuall in the Old Testament to say, Holy Abraham pray for me, but men of those tymes only prayed to God, and alledged the merits of Saints, who then were dead, that by them their praiers might be holpen.

Caluins reply to this place is, that God is not heere innocated by the merits of his Saints, nor elswhere, but onely that there is a rehearsall made of the Couenant, which God made with the Patriarches, concerning the helping & protecting of their posterity. But this euasion being a meer collusion of Caluin, wil not serue his turne; for in these kind of praiers, not only mentiō is made of Gods Couenant, but further, the righteousnes & merits of Gods Saints are cōmemorated. And so you shal read in the Psalmes, that Salomon innocating God, praied thus, (51) *Lord remember Dauid, & all his meekenes*: & a litle after, (52) *For thy seruāt Dauids sake turne not away the face of thyne annointed Christ*. These are the words of Salomon, innocating God by the merits of his Father Dauid deceased, as (53) appeareth elswhere. Againe (54) *For Dauids sake our Lord his God gaue him a lampe in Hierusalem, that he might rayse vp his sonne after him, and establish Hierusalem, because Dauid had done right in the eyes of our Lord &c.* And there would be no end, if I should cyte all those places, where God is innocated by the merits of his Saints, all which make against Caluins impostures: and therfore see Daniel 3. Exodus 34. and Hieremie 32.

(51) *Psal.* 131. 2.
(52) *Ibid.* 10.
(53) 2. *Paral.* 6. 42.
(54) 3. *Reg.* 15. 4 5.

Iob is sent by his friend Eliphas to the Angels, to innocate them, (55) *Call therefore of there be any to answere thee, and turne thee to some of the Saints*. And Iob himselfe in another place innocateth the Angells thus, (56) *Haue mercy vpon me, haue mercy vpon me, O you my friends, for the hand of God hath touched me*. S. Austine (57) by *Saints* in the first place, and *friends* in this last, thinketh the holy *Angells* to be vnderstood: Which supposed, it is euident, that it was then a custome of the Church to innocate the holy Angels.

(55) *Iob.* 5. 1.
(56) *Cap.* 19. 21.
(57) *In annot. in Iob. c.* 19.

S. Iohn the Euangelist himselfe innocated the 7 Spirits for grace and peace to the Churches of Asia, praying thus,

(58)

(58) *Grace to you and peace from him that is, and that was, and that shall come, and from the 7. spirits which are in the sight of his Throne, and from Iesus Christ &c.* where we are to note, that S. Iohn thought it no Idolatry to inuocate the 7. Spirits, in the same place, where he inuocated two persons of the B. Trinity; but the meaning is, that the 7. *spirits* should be Intercessors, for obtayning at Gods hand, Grace and peace for the Churches of Asia. Now, that by those 7. *spirits*, are meant 7. Angels, is confirmed by those words of Raphael, saying, (59) *I am one of the 7 holy Angels, which present the prayers of the Saintes.* And in the fifth Chapter of the Apocalyps, mention is made agreably to this, of (60) *the 7. spirits of God sent into all the Earth:* for which cause S. Paul calleth the Angels, (61) *Ministring spirits, sent to minister for them which shall receiue the Inheritance of saluation:* Yea this place is so strong for inuocation of Angels, that the Prot. Wygandus, though he will not acknowledge inuocation of Angels herby proued, yet faith herof, (62) *Praeter morem reliquarum Scripturarum &c. Contrary to other Scriptures, he asketh grace from the 7. spirits in the first Chapter.* So that this Prot. best answere, is to make this place of Scripture contrary to the rest.

(58) *Apoc.* 1.4. and see c.3.6.

(59) Tob.12. 15.

(60) C.5.6.

(61) Heb.1. 14.

And it is more then probable, that the Iewes present at our Saniours death, could not haue bene so easily persuaded to thinke and say, that our Sauiour saying, (63) *Eli, Eli, Lamma Sabacthani*, called *Elias*, if the Inuocation of Saintes had not then bene familiar and vsuall to them: which might be further proued by seuerall testimonies (64) of the ancient Iewes, and later Rabines.

(62) *Syntagma Col.* 390.

(63) *Mat* 27. 46. *Marc.* 15.34.

(64) *Plautus Iosephus de bello Iudaico. l.* 3. *c.* 14. *Iosephus Bengorion in Bello Iudaico, cap.* 2. *Symbolum fidei Iudaeorum fol* 22. 28.

Throughout the whole Scriptures you shall read, how the liuing called vpon the liuing, to pray for them; did not Abraham (65) pray for Abimelech, and that by Gods appointment and promise to Abimelech? Did not Iob (66) by Gods appointment pray for his three friends, when God said vnto them, *Go to my seruant Iob, he shall pray for you. him will I accept &c.*? Did not the Israelites cry vnto Samuel, (67) *Cease not to cry to the Lord our God for vs, that he deliuer vs out of the hands of the Philistines*? Did not God (68) seeke for a man that should stand before him in prayer for the Land,

(65) *Gen.* 20.

(66) *Iob* 42. 8.

(67) 1 *Reg.* 7

(68) *Ezech.* 22. 30.

that he ſhould not deſtroy it? Did not the Iſraelites, when they had ſinned, intreat Moyſes to pray (69) for them, which he did accordingly? Did not S. Paul ſay, (70) *I beſeech you brethren help me with your prayers*, which elſwhere (71) he often beggeth? And doth not S. Iames (72) giue the reaſon, *for the continuall prayer of a iuſt man auayleth much*? And are we not admoniſhed *to pray* (73) *one for another*? And although theſe Examples do concerne the liuing only, yet the reaſon which S. Iames rendreth, which is, becauſe the prayer of the iuſt auayleth much, doth much more extend to the Interceſſion of the Saintes and Angels in heauen, by how much they are more iuſt, and alſo more gracious in behoulding the face of God for vs, for which cauſe they are called our Angels, as it is ſaid before (74) *Their Angels behould Gods face*. The truth and ſequele wherof is more certaine, in that no Texts of Scripture be alleadged againſt our inuocation of Angels and Saintes, but the ſame do as much impugne the interceſſion of the liuing. Laſtly, if there can be imagined any reaſon or impedimet to hinder this our Inuocation of them, either it is becauſe they will not help vs, and this is againſt their Charity, which is far greater, and much more increaſed, then it was in this life, they being in the height of their Charity: or becauſe they cannot; and not this, for this were infirmity, and ſhould much derogate from their ſtate of glory; and if they could helpe vs by their prayers when they were here with vs, and abſent from God, in regard of their Pilgrimage, much more now can they ayd vs, being now preſent with God, and poſſeſſed of their kingdome of heauen: or peraduenture becauſe they know not we aske, and this were to charge them with greater ignorance, then is aſcribed to the Deuils, and to depriue them of a knowledge neceſſarily belonging to their ſtate of happines and content: Or laſtly, for that it were derogatory to Gods honour, and Chriſtes Mediation, if any other were inuocated, and made Aduocate to God; and not this, for firſt this maketh more for Gods honour, ſince the more honourable the Interceſſors to God for vs be, the more honour redoundeth to God: And if our inuocation of them for their Interceſſion

(69) *Numer.* 21.7.
(70) *Rom.* 15.30.
(71) *Epheſ.* 6.18. *Theſſ.* 5. 2. *Theſſ.* 3. *Coloſſ* 4. *Heb.* 13.
(72) *Iacob.* 5. 16.
(73) *Iac.* 5.16.
(74) *Mat.* 18. 10. *Act.* 12 15.

to God for vs, were derogatory to Christes mediation, then neither could we pray for one another without iniury to Christ, seeing we make one another now liuing, in the same sense, Mediatours and Aduocates to God.

SECT. III.

Scriptures expounded by most ancient Fathers in proofe of the Intercession of Angells and Saints, and that we may lawfully inuocate them.

IN proofe that Saints know things vpon earth, S. Austine expoundeth some Texts by me alledged saying, (1) *If the Prophet Eliseus absent in body saw his seruant Giezi receyuing rewards, which Naaman Syrus had giuen him &c. how much more shall the Saints see all things in that spirituall body, not onely if they shut their eyes, but also where they are absent in body? for then shallbe perfected that, whereof the Apostle speaking,* (2) *In part, saith he, we know, and in part we prophecy, but when that shall come that is perfect, that shalbe made void that is in part.*

(1) *De Cuit. Dei l.22. c.29*

(2) *1.Cor.13. 9.*

S. Hilary expoundeth seuerall Texts of Scripture for the Intercession of Angells, saying, (3) *There are according to S. Iohn Angels deputed for the Churches of Asia, and by the Testimony of Moyses the limits of the Nations were appointed to the sonnes of Adam, according to the number of the Angells. And in the doctrine of our Sauiour, the Angels of litle ones do daily see God. There are according to Raphael speaking to Tobias, Angels assisting the diuine Maiesty and Clarity, and offering vp vnto God the prayers of such as inuocate God &c. Therefore not the nature of God needeth the Intercession of these Angells, but our infirmity; for they are sent for them who shalbe heyres of saluation: God being ignorant of nothing that we do, but our infirmity needing the ministery of spirituall Intercession to intreate &c.* In which passage of this glorious Confessour, two things are worthy of obseruation; first, that three of the very same places of Scripture cyted by me, are likewise cyted and vrged by him, for proofe of the Patronage, Intercession, and Inuocation of Angels, to which he addeth a fourth

(3) *In Comment. in Ps. 129.*

out of Geneſis. Secondly, that the booke of Tobias is eſteemed by him for Canonicall Scripture, ſince it is ranked by him equally with the *Apocalips*, and *Geneſis*.

S. Hierome writing vpon thoſe wordes of the Angell to Daniel, *Et ego ingreſſus ſum ad verba tua*, ſaith, (4) *This is the meaning thereof, After thou dideſt begin with good workes, and teares, and faſting, to invocate Gods mercy, and I tooke occaſion that I might enter into the ſight of God, and pray for thee &c.* And in the ſame place Commenting vpon theſe words of the Angell a little after, *Et nemo eſt adiutor meus in omnibus his, niſi Michael princeps veſter. None is my helper in all theſe, but Michael your prince, he concludeth thus, ſpeaking in the perſon of the Angell, I am, ſayth he, that Angell who offers thy prayers to God, and I haue no other helper to intreat God for you, but Michael the Archangell, to whoſe Patronage & protection, the people of the Iewes is commended.*

(4) In C. 10. Dan.

The ſame S. Hierome writing vpon theſe words of S. Matthew, *Their Angels in heauen alwayes do ſee &c.* ſaith (5) *Great is the dignity of ſoules, in ſo much that euery one hath from his Nativity, an Angell deputed by God for his Patronage.* And immediatly after in further proofe of guardian Angels, he citeth both that of (6) *S. Iohn vnto the Angell of Epheſus, Thyatira, and the Angell of Philadelphia, and to the Angells of the other 4. Churches:* as alſo that of the Apoſtle, (7) *that women ought to haue their heads couered for the Angels.*

(5) *In Mat.* 18. 10.

(6) *Apoc.* 1 & 2. *l.* 8. 11. 18. & 3. 1. 7.

(7) 1. Cor. 11. 10.

S. Auſtine writing vpon thoſe words of the Pſalmiſt, *Annunciabitur Domino generatio venturæ &c.* he expounderh it thus, (8) *It is not ſo to be vnderſtood, that any thing ſhould be told vnto God, as being ignorant of any thing, to the end that he may know it; but euen as the Angels do declare, not only Gods benefits vnto vs, but alſo our prayers vnto him &c.* And then for warrant of this Expoſition, he citeth that place of (9) *Tobias* by vs formerly alledged, and ſo expounded by S. Hilary, as you haue heard, *For it is written, where the Angell ſayth vnto men, I haue offered vp by way of mentioning your prayers, not that God ſhall know what we will, or what we ſtand in need of, for your heauenly Father, ſaith our Lord, knoweth what you ſtand in need of, before you aske of him: but becauſe &c.* And in like ſort writeth (10) Euſebius. (11) *In the booke of Machabees, Hieremy the Prophet is ſayd to be ſeene after his death*

(8) *Epiſt.* 120. c. 29.

(9) Tob. 12. 12.

(10) *Euſeb. Cæſar. l.* 12. *de Præpar. Euang. c.* 1.

(11) 2. Mach. 15. 14.

death praying for the people, as having care of men yet living vpō earth.

S. Austine expounding those words of Iob, *Miseremini mei &c.* writeth thus. (12) *He seemeth to invocate the Angells, that they would supplicate for him, or certainly the Saintes, that they would pray for him penitent.* And elswhere, (13) *Iacob blessing his Nephewes, the sonnes of Ioseph, amongst other things sayth,* (14) *My name shallbe called vpon them, and the name of my fathers; where it is to be noted, that not only bearing, but also invocation sometymes are affirmed, as things not proper vnto God, but to men,* also.

(12) *Annot. in c. 19. Iob, Conc. 2. ad c. 19.*
(13) *L. 1. de loquutionibus in Genes.*
(14) *Gen. 48. 16.*

Origen in proofe that Saints do pray for vs sayth, (15) *All the Saints which are departed out of this life bearing yet Charity towards the living in this world, it shall not be inconvenient, if they be sayd, to haue a care of their salvation, and to help them with their prayers, and intercession with God for them: for it is written* (sayth he) *in the booke of Machabees thus,* (16) *This is Hieremy the Prophet of God, who alwayes prayeth for the people.*

(15) *Ho. 31 in Cant.*
(16) *2. 15.*

S. Chrysostome is of opinion, that it was an Angell whom Iacob invocated, and not Christ, as Prot. imagine, when he blessed Iosephs Children, his wordes are plaine, (17) *For if Angells be designed by him that is Lord of all, to those who only governe their owne lyfe, and doing nothing for the common vtility, as one of the iust satisfyeth, saying, The Angell which hath deliuered me from my youth: much more present are those heauenly powers vnto them, to whom the care of the whole world is committed, and to such as carry the burdens of such gouernes.*

(17) *Tom. 3. ho 7 in laudibus Paul.*

S. Chrysostome building as it were vpon the promises of the Apostles to pray for the Church after their Martyrdomes, and especially vpon that of S. Peter before mentioned, inuocateth them thus, (18) *Reioyce euer (you blessed Apostles) in our Lord, without intermission pray for vs, fulfill your promises: For ô Blessed Peter, thou cryest out speaking thus,* (19) *I will do my diligence, after my Comming to make mention of you.*

(18) *Tom. 5. in orat encom. in natali Apost. seu Martyr. Pet. & Pauli prope finem.*

We are much bound (sayth S. Leo) (20) *to giue thankes to our Lord and Redeemer Iesus Christ, that hath giuen so great power to him, whom he made the Prince of the whole Church, that if in our tyme also any thing be done well, and be rightly ordered by vs, it is to be imputed to his workes and his Gouernment, to whom it was said, And thou being Conuerted, confirme thy brethren: and to whom our Lord*

(19) *2. Epist. 1. 15.*
(20) *Ser. 3 in Anniuers. Assumpt. ad Pontif.*

after his Reſurrection ſaid thrice, feed my sheep: which now alſo without doubt the godly Paſtor doth execute, confirming vs with his Exhortations, and not ceaſing to pray for vs, that we be ouercome with no temptation. What more plaine for S. Peters praying for vs after his deceaſe? But D. Fulke (21) himſelfe confeſſeth that, *Leo indeed &c. aſcribeth much to the prayers of S. Peter for him.* Yea (22) S. Clement affirmeth, that S. Peter encouraging him to take after his deceaſe the charge of the Apoſtolicke Roman Sea, promiſed that after his departure he would not ceaſe to pray for him and his flocke, thereby to eaſe him of his Paſtorall burden. Thus then you ſee, as appeareth by theſe Fathers Expoſition of Scriptures, how cleere the Scriptures are for Inuocation of Angels and Saintes, if credit may be giuen to the ancient Bleſſed Fathers ſo expounding them.

(21) Againſt Rhem Teſt. in. 1 Pet. 1. 15 p. 443.
(22) *Tom. 1. Conc. Ep. 1. Clem. init.*

But the Fathers Doctrine is ſo cleere for Inuocation of Saintes and Angels, that D. Fulke ſayth, (23) *I Confeſſe that Ambroſe, Auſtine, and Hierome, held inuocation of Saintes to be lawfull:* And, (23) *that many of the ancient Fathers held this opinion, that the Saintes departed do pray for vs, we deny not &c. In Nazianzen, Baſil, & Chryſoſtome, there is ſome mention of the Inuocation of Saintes to helpe with their prayers &c. Theodore alſo ſpeaketh of prayers vnto Martyrs.* Chemnitius hauing alleadged S. Auſtine praying to S. Cyprian martyred before, concludeth this therof, (24) *Auſtine did this without the Scripture, yielding to the tymes and cuſtome.* And againe, (25) *Inuocation of Saintes began to be brought into the publick aſſemblies of the Church, about the yeare of our Lord 370. by Baſil, Nyſſen, and Nazianzene.* The Centuriſtes ſpeaking of the tymes of Cyprian and Origen, do confeſſe, that they (26) *Containe manifeſt tokens of the Inuocation of Saintes.* Now, wheras D. Morton would euade all teſtimonies of Fathers in this behalfe, by affirming that they were but (27) *Rhetoricall Apoſtrophe's,* Chemnitius ſhall giue him a brotherly checke for this ſo ſimple and vntrue Euaſion, by not excuſing with *Rhetoricall Apoſtrophe's,* but flatly accuſing and reiecting (28) *Moſt of the Fathers, as Nazianzen, Nyſſen, Theodoret, Ambroſe, Hierome &c. who* ſayth he, *did not diſpute, but auouch the ſoules of Martyrs and Saintes &c. to heare*

(21) Reioinder to Briſtow. pa. 5.
(21) Againſt Rhem. Teſt. p. 443.
(24) *Exam. part. 3. p. 111.*
(25) *Ibid. p. 200.*
(26) *Cent. 3. c. 4. col. 83.*
(27) Appeale p. 127.
(28) *Exam. part 3. p. 111.* See Perkins vol. 2. p. 592.

heare the Petitions of thoſe that prayed, and to carry them to God &c. they went to the Monuments of Martyrs, and often inuocated the Martyrs by name. This is confeſſedly more, M. Morton, then to make Rhetoricall Apoſtrophe's.

But D. Whitguift, and D. Couell doe both of them affirme, that, (29) *Almoſt all the Biſhops and learned writers of the Greeke Church, and Latin alſo for the moſt part, were ſpotted with Doctrines &c. of Inuocation of Saintes, and ſuch like.* So generally was this our Catholike doctrine of Inuocation of Saintes taught by the ancient Fathers. (29) Def. p. 472. Couell againſt the Plea of the Innoc. c. 9. p. 110.

Now for the cloſure of this Section from Fathers, Bullinger labouring to confute the diſtinction of *Dulia* and *Latria*, and falſly affirming, that Catholickes do attribute more by Dulia to Saintes and Angels, then by Latria to God, he addeth that, (30) *S. Iohn* (the Euangeliſt) *was enwrapped in this Errour.* And that, *he would exhibite the worſhip of Dulia to the Angell: but God permitted ſo great a man to ſinne.* Yea, ſaith he, (31) *forgetfull of all the admonitions by the Angell, he fell againe into the ſame fault.* So that S. Iohn is heere condemned with Catholikes for worſhipping of Angels with Dulia. But now whether S. Iohn did better vnderſtand what honour was due, & to be giuen to Angels, then Prot. do, I leaue to any mãs iudgment. And though S. Iohn erred in the perſon of the Angel, as thinking him to be Chriſt himſelfe, yet that he was ignorant in knowing what honour was due to Chriſt, and what to Angels, no Chriſtian will affirme. (30) *Ser. 84. in Apoc. 19.* (31) *Serm. 97. in Apoc. 22.*

SECT. IV.

That Proteſtants do agreably teach with Catholikes that the Angells and Saints in heauen do heare our prayers, do pray for vs in particular: and that we may lawfully to them.

THat Angels and Saints do know things done vpon Earth, and pray for vs, Piſcator and Bullinger confeſſe of Angels, (1) *That they reioyce at our repentance.* Fulke, (2) *That they* (1) *Vol. 2. Theſ. p. 96. ſec. 47. & p. 294. ſec. 27.* Bulling. in his Dec. in Engl. p. 719. and ſee *Luc. 15. 10.* (2) *Ag. Rhem. Teſt. f. 113.*

they know our fruites and true effects thereof. Piſcator, (3) That we ſhould be aſhamed to commit any vncleane actions, ſeeing that they do behould and obſerue all our actions. Fulke, and others, (4) That they do wayte for our preſeruation.

Bullinger that, (5) They offer the prayers of the faythfull in Gods preſence. Others (6) that both Saints and Angels ſuch as are in happines do pray for the Church: and that (7) we ioyne in prayer with all Saints in heauen and Earth: Alſo that (8) The Saints in heauen, do not ceaſe to make Interceſſion for vs.

The Lutherans that write the Apology for the Confeſſion of Auguſta, do gather from the forcyted place of Zachary, that (9) Angels pray for vs.

Oecolampadius (10) affirmeth that, The Saints in heauen burning yet with their Charity do not ceaſe to pray for vs. And in another place, (11) The bleſſed Spirits &c. are not without deſire of our Saluation, which I thinke to be their prayers: And ſo Peter and Paul do pray with vs, Thy kingdome come.

Melanchton is ſo confident heerein, as that he ſaith, (12) I will cyte a manifeſt place out of the New Teſtament, proouing that the dead are carefull of the Church and vs, for ſo Matthew ſayth (13) Elias and Moyſes ſpake with Chriſt of things to come. It is certayne that the Saints which are in heauen in care of vs, are affected towards the Church of thoſe that liue vpon earth: Euen as they there diſputed with Chriſt of his Paſſion, & the gathering of the Church through the whole world.

Brentius propoſeth this Queſtion (14) Do the dead then pray for the liuing? And now he giueth his anſwere, Surely it cannot be denyed, but theſe who liue in Chriſt, do wiſh well to the Church and her members: for if they Angels pray for vs, as (15) Zachary witneſſeth, and if Chriſt himſelfe pray for vs to his Father, how then are not the Saints affected towards vs in Charity in Chriſt, and by Chriſt, and wiſh vs all happines of God.

Faber writeth thus plainly. (16) I do not doubt but the ſoules of the dead remember their parents, brethren, Siſters, and kinſfolkes, which they haue left heere, and pray, to God that he will alſo deliuer them out of the vale of teares &c. The example of the rich mã Luc. 16. confirmeth this doctrine: for if a damned ſoule remembreth his (friends) much more a bleſſed Soule is ſo affected towards Pa-

(1) Piſc. vbi ſupra p. 98.
(4) Fulke vbi ſup. in Mat. 18. ſect. 2.
Bulling Dec. p. 742. Hippius metho. Theol. 2 p. 290.
(5) Ib. p. 865.
(6) Conf. of Sax. in the Harm. p. 43.
(7) Ib p. 12.
(9) Oecolamp. ad ſerm. Chryſoſt. de Pœnitentio & Maximo. Brent. ad c. 20. Luc. Chytr. ad c. 25. Mat. Cruciger in Conc. de Natiu.
See Fox in Apoc. c. 8. p. 127.
(9) Apol. Confeſſ. Auguſt. de inuocat. Sanctorum fol. 179.
(10) Ad orat. Chryſ. de Inuent. & Max.
(11) Ad c. 22. Danielis.
(12) In loc. com Mathij fol. 151.
(13) Mat. 17. 3.

rents, Children, Brethren, Sisters, and kynsfolkes.

And wheras P. ot. to anoyd the history of *Lazarus* and *Dives*, which plainly sheweth that soules departed this lyfe do yet know things done vpon Earth, do affirme, that it is only a Parable: Yet Caluin for his part thinketh otherwise with vs, saying, (17) *Although to some it seeme only a single Parable, yet because the name of Lazarus is expressed, I rather thinke, that a thing done is declared.* (14) *Ad. 6. 10. Lucæ.* (15) *C. 1, 12.* (16) *De statu defunctorum. c. 7.* (17) *Harm. in Luc. 16. 19.*

Concerning the Patronage of Angels, Caluin writeth, (18) *They say, the prayers of Angels are often read of, and not this only, but the prayers of the faithfull are said to be carried by their hands into the sight of God: I confesse it.* And a little after, *It is assigned to the Angels that they be ministring spirits, to whom the ministery is committed of the care of our Saluation, to whom the Charge is giuen of keeping vs in all our wayes, who may compasse vs about, who may admonish, and comfort, and may watch for vs.* And againe, *God appointed Angels ouer vs, to take care of our safety: wherupon they frequent the holy assemblyes, and the Church is to them a Theater in which they admire the different and manifold wisdome of God. To conclude, I dare not affirme for certayne, whether to euery one of the faithfull seuerall Angels be appointed.* (20) *Truly when Daniel* bringeth in the Angell of the Persians, and the Grecians, he signifyeth *that certaine Angels are deputed, as Gouernours ouer kingdomes and Prouinces. Christ also when he saith,* (21) *The Angels of Children do alwayes see the face of the Father, doth insinuate, that there are certaine Angels to whom their safety is committed. But I know not whether from thence it may be gathered, that euery one hath his Angell to haue charge ouer him.* And somewhat after, *There is one place a litle clearer then the rest, which seemeth to confirmett: for when* (22) *Peter brought out of Prison knocked at the gates of the howse in which the brethren were gathered togeather, seeing they could not suspect that it was he, they said it was his Angell. It seemeth this came into their myndes from the common conceipt, that Angels are assigned as Gouernors to euery one of the faithfull.* With Caluin agreeth Luther saying, (23) *Euery Emperour King, Prince, yea euery man hath his Angell.* And, (24) *The Scripture testifyeth euery Christian to haue his Angell.* (18) *Inst. l. 3. c. 20. §. 23. Edit. Gal. 1562. 1563. See. l. 1, c. 14. §. 7.* (19) *Inst. l. 1. c. 14. §. 7.* (20) *Dan. 10. 13. 20. & 12. 1.* (21) *Mat. 18. 10.* (22) *Act. 12. 15.* It is his Angell. (23) *Ad. c. 2. Zachariæ.* (24) *Ad. c. 18. Matthæi.*

Add yet heerunto the professed faith of sundry of our

English Foxian Martyrs, Lambert beleiued that, (25) *The Saintes departed pray for vs.* The like also did (26) Bilney. Latimer also acknowledged the same saying, (27) *There be two manner of Mediators, the one by way of Redemption, the other by way of Intercession.* And againe, (28) *I take worshipping of Saintes for praying to them, I neuer denyed but that they might so be worshiped, & be our Mediators &c. by way of Intercession.* Of like beliefe was the Church in the tyme of K. Henry the Eight, and so also were sundry other Prot. Martyrs in M. Fox his Monuments, whome we do not fynd charged with the contrary Doctrine.

(25) *Act. Mon. p. 349. a. init.*
(26) *Ibid p. 402. b. post. med.*
(27) *Ibid. p. 1312. a. init*
(28) *Ibid p. 1315 a. paulo ante med.*

Iohn Husse was accustomed to inuocate the B. Virgin and other Saintes, (29) *I aske also* (sayth he) *for my very accusers the most chast Virgin the Mother of my Sauiour, the repayrer of mankind, the Queene of heauen, which by the title of grace added to nature, excelleth the Angelicall nature, who amongst all the blessed excepting her sonne, is more blessed, by singular Priuiledge, more glorious, by grace and the guiftes of glory, more fruitfull. Of whose fulnes, saith Bernard, all receyue; the sick health, the sorrowfull comfort, the Angels ioy, the sonne of God the substance of humane flesh, the whole Trinity glory.* And in another place, (30) *We haue an Aduocate, to wit, in matters of Soules, not of possessions. And not only an Aduocate, but also an Aduocatresse: whereupon we sing, Eia ergo Aduocata.* And to other Saintes he prayeth also, (31) *Peter and Paul glorious Martyrs, so ioyned to the K of glory, vouchsafe to pray for vs, that by their help we being made strong, by suffering humbly, may be partakers of their glory.* Againe, he inuocateth *S. Iohn Baptist* saying, (32) *Vouchsafe to pray for vs vnto our Lord Iesus Christ, Amen.*

(29) *In fidei suæ Elucidationes.*
(30) *In 1. Io. c. 2.*
(31) *Ep. 22.*
(32) *Ep. 30.*
(33) *Resp. ad Louan. in Tom. Wittemb.*

To try now what Martin Luther thinketh, (33) *I neuer denyed* (sayth he) *vs to be holpen by the merits and prayers of Saintes, though imperfect.* And, (34) *I neuer thought the Inuocation of Saintes to be offensiue &c. this do our heretical Picards and Bohemians know.* And in another place he sayth, (35) *Suffer them to implore the Patronage of Saintes, since they so will, yet with that Condition, that they know they must take heed, least they put any trust and presumption in any of the Saintes, being induced therto by a false persuasion.* And yet more fully; (36) *Concerning the*

(34) *In Ep. ad Georg. Spalatinum.*
(35) *In Ep. ad Erphordienses.*
(36) *In purgationes quorundam Articulorum.*

the Interceſsion of Saintes, I agree with the whole Chriſtian Church, and iudge that the Saintes are to be inuocated and honoured, for who can contradict thoſe things which God doth wonderfully, and viſibly worke, euen to this preſent day at the Sepulchers of Saintes? Yea his aduiſe is this, (37) *At the houre of death, let him not ceaſe to inuocate the B. Virgin, his Apoſtle, and the reſt of the Saintes, whom he hath ſerued in his lyfe, that they may pray for him to our Lord.* And now he teacheth the manner how we may lawfully pray to Saintes ſaying, (38) *Some man may heere ſay, of what vſe, and in what ſtead ſhall Saintes be to vs? Thou vſeſt them as thou vſeſt thy Neighbour, for as thou ſayeſt to him, Pray to God for me, ſo thou mayeſt ſay to them, S. Peter pray for me.* Againe, (39) *I ſaid, Mary would not be a Goddeſſe, ſhe maketh nothing: God worketh all things. She ought to be inuocated, that God by her may giue and worke what we aske, and in this ſort all the reſt of the Saintes are to be inuocated &c.* So Catholickly Luther.

(37) *De prep. ad mort.*

(38) *In ſer. Ioan Bapt.*

(39) *Super Magnificat. Tom. 6. Germ. fol 22.* and ſee *de 2. Præcepto.*

With Luther agreeth Oecolampadius ſaying, (40) *Neither will I affirme it to be Idolatry, to requeſt the Patronage of Saintes, for the Saints in heauen burning yet with their Charity, do not ceaſe to pray for vs, and what euill is it, if we requeſt that to be, which we beliue God would, although he hath not commanded any ſuch thing &c. This do Chryſoſtome and Nazianzene; and this alſo almoſt all the Churches of the Eaſt and Weſt do obſerue.*

(40) *Ad orat. Chryſoſt. de Iuuentio & Maximo Martyribus.*

Bucer affirmeth, that (41) *If any weighing the infinite Indulgence &c. of God towards his Saints &c. And do intreat them to make interceſsion to God for them, although that be not taught in the Scripture, yet if it be done, none of vs condemne it.* And in another place he iuſtifieth our Catholike māner of praying to Saints ſaying, (42) *Seeing in theſe prayers whatſoeuer is aſcribed to the Interceſsions and merits of Saints, al that is asked is not from the Saints thēſelues, but from the mercy of God by our Lord Ieſus Chriſt: heerby ſuch as pray thus, confeſſe and teſtify themſelues to acknowledge thoſe things to be the free giftes of God, which they beg of God by the interceſsion and merits of Saints.*

(41) In Deu. ſent. cont. Abrincenſem Epiſcopum.

(42) *In Diſp. Ratisb. de publicis Eccleſiæ precibus.*

Haffenrefferus (43) affirmeth, that the Deuines of Polonia in their late Synod, defended prayer to Saints *with this moderation*, as namely, *that they ſhould be inuocated not as granters, but as Interceſſours.*

(43) *Loci Theol. l. 3. ſtat 4. loco, 3. p. 463.*

And somewhat agreably heerunto say sundry Prot. (44) *If we will speake of the true and great Mediatour, there is but one Mediatour betweene God and man, Iesus-Christ:* (but) *If we will speake of the Mediatour of praying, every godly man is made a mediatour ech for other: according as it is said*, (45) *Help me with your prayers:* (46) *Brethren pray for vs. And this kind of Intercession doth not* (as the Prot. Viril confesseth) (47) *take any thing away from the Intercession of Christ.*

(44) Wittemberg. in the Harmony. p.172.
(45) Rom. 15.30.
(46) 1. Thess. 5.25 & 2. Thess. 3.1. & Col. 4.2.
(47) Treatise concerning the principall grounds of Chr. Relig. p.188.

So euident it is both by Scriptures, Fathers, and Protestants, that euery man hath his Angell guardian, that the Angels and Saints do heare our praiers, do pray for vs, and that we may pray to them.

SECT. V.

Obiections from Scriptures against Invocation of Angells and Saints, answered.

SOme obiect, that none must be inuocated, but in whom we belieue, according to that of S. Paul to the Romanes. (1) *How then shall they inuocate, in whome they haue not beliued?* Answere. This is spoken of Gentiles, who not belieuing in Christ, nor hauing heard of him, could not inuocate him: and in like sort it may be sayd, that those who do not belieue that there are Saints, or do not hope in them as Patrones, cannot inuocate them. Besides the words, *Inuocation and Faith*, are not alwayes attributed to God only, for Iacob sayth, (2) *Let my name be inuocated vpon these Children, and the names of my Fathers, Abraham, Isaac &c.* Vpon which wordes S. Austine commenteth thus, (3) *Whereupon it is to be obserued not onely that hearing, but also inuocation sometimes are affirmed as things not proper to God, but to men.* In like sort cōcerning Faith, S. Paul writeth, (4) *I giue thankes to my God &c. hearing thy Charity and fayth which thou hast in our Lord Iesus, and towards all the Saintes:* vpon which place S. Hierome demandeth (5) *how any one can haue the same fayth in Christ Iesus, & towards his Saints?* To which himselfe answereth, *for the exposition of this place let vs take examples from* (6) *Exodus, The people beliued God and Moyses his seruant;*

(1) 10.14.
(2) Gen. 48. 16.
(3) lib. loquutionis de Gen. prope fin.
(4) Philem. v.4.
(5) In Ep. ad ad Philem.
(6) 14.31.

nant: one and the ſame beliefe is referred towards Moyſes, & towards God, that the people which believed in our Lord, ſhould alike be ſayd to believe in his ſeruant: but this is not only towards Moyſes, but towards all his Saints, that whoſoeuer hath believed in God, could not otherwiſe haue had fayth, vnles he had believed towards his Saints, for it is not perfect Charity, & fayth towards God, which is leſſened towards his ſeruants with hatred and Infidelity.

Secondly, in proofe that Saints do not know our prayers, it is obiected, that (7) *God only knoweth the harts of all the Children of men*; and in the booke of Iob, (8) *Whether his Children be noble or ignoble, he ſhall not vnderſtand.* And yet in a third place, (9) *For the liuing know that they ſhall dye, but the dead know nothing at all.* And that alſo of Eſay, (10) *For thou art our Father, & Abraham hath knowne vs, and Iſrael hath been ignorant of vs.* And laſtly that of the Kings (11) *I will gather thee to thy Fathers &c. that thy eyes may not ſee all the euill which I will bring vpō this place.* From theſe and ſuch other like places is inferred, that it is vaine to Inuocate Saints, ſeeing they know not our prayers. Anſw. All grant, that only God knoweth naturally, and by his owne power, the thoughts of all mens harts, but this hindreth not, but that Saints may know ſuch thoughts as God manifeſteth vnto them, whether this be by cleere and perfect viſion of God himſelfe, or by particular reuelation from his Deity, or laſtly by the miniſtery of other his ſernãts, be they Saints or Angels. And as for the words of Iob, they only proue that naturally the dead do not know the deeds of the liuing; & the very ſelfeſame thing proueth the place following of Eccleſiaſtes: but what maketh this againſt ſuch as are enlightned ſupernaturally with the preſence of God, hauing their vnderſtandings to that end eleuated with the light of glory, or els that come to know of thinges paſſing heer by ſupernaturall meanes. That of Abraham, Saint (12) Hierome expoundeth of the knowledg of approbation, or acknowlegement of them for his, ſo that the meaning is, Abraham knew vs not, that is, he tooke vs not for his Children, but deſpiſeth vs, becauſe he knoweth, that we haue departed from thee our God. *Abraham knoweth vs not &c.* ſaith S. Hierome giuing the reaſon, *becauſe we haue offended thee;*

(7) 3. Reg. 8. 39.
(8) C. 14. 21.
(9) Eccleſiaſtes 9. 5.
(10) C. 63. 16.
(11) 4 Reg. 22. 20.
(12) In Com. in Iſaiæ, 63. 16.

neyther do they acknowledge those for their Children, whome they vnderstand not to be beloued of their God. In which very sense our B. Sauiour speaketh vnto the foolish Virgins (13), *Amen I say vnto you, I know you not.* Which phrase of speach Christ also vseth vnto those reprobate, who stood knocking at the doore whē Christ was entred, (14) *I know you not whence you are.* But if this knowledge whereof mention is heere made, be vnderstood properly, it proueth no more (as neyther any of the places obiected do) but that the Fathers who were in *Lymbus Patrum*, or Abrahams bosome, knew not as then naturally, or by any ordinary supernaturall meanes, what their posterity liuing did, seeing as then they were not blessed with the cleere sight of God, which I hope Prot. dare not affirme of the Saints departed, since our Redemption by Christ.

(13) Mat. 25. 12.

(14) Luc. 13. 25.

In conclusion, for full satisfaction of these obiectiōs, let S. Austine answere for me, who hauing moued diuers obiections *pro & con*, both how the dead should know and not know, did know and did not know, the affayres of their liuing friends, at last resolueth the point thus: (15) *Therefore we must confesse, that the dead indeed do not know what is done here, but whilest any thing is here done, that afterward truly they heare of them, who go hence to them by dying: not all things verily, but such things as they are suffered to declare, who are suffered both to remember these things, as also such things as is meete for them to heare, to whom they relate these things. Moreouer the dead may heare of the Angels who are present to things done here something, which he, to whom all things are subiect, iudgeth cōuenient for euery one of them to heare: for vnlesse there were Angels, who might be present at the places both of the liuing and dead, our Lord Iesus had neuer said, It happened also that the poore man dyed, and was caryed by Angels into Abrahams bosome. Now therfore heare, now there may they haue bene, who haue taken hence thither those whom God would. Moreouer the spirits of the dead may know some things done here by the spirit of God reuealing, which it is necessary that they should know, and not necessary that they should be ignorant of not only things past or present, but also things to come: as not all men, but Prophets did know, whilest they liued here; neither did they know all things but such things as the Prouidence of God did iudge meete to be reueyled vnto them.* Hitherto

(15) L. de cura pro mort. agenda, c. 14. & 15.

S. Au-

S. Auſtine. The ſumme of all is but this, that Saintes departed know things done here three manner of wayes, to wit, by Saintes hence departing to them, by Angels declaring, and Gods holy ſpirit reuealing: and this may ſuffice for a full anſwere to all places brought in this ſecond obiection.

The third Obiection is taken out of that place of S. Paul to Timothy, (16) *For there is one God, one alſo Mediator of God and men, Ieſus Chriſt*, therefore we muſt not make any Saintes our Mediatours. To make this the ſtronger, the Prot. of Geneua in their Bible of Anno 1601. by Mathew Berion, do adde the word, *ſolus*, one only Mediatour. Anſwere The word, *ſolus*, is neither in the Greeke, nor the vulgar latine, nor in thoſe of Beza of 1589. 1590. nor others of Geneua of 1555. 1563. 1564 1570. and ſo the place is maliciouſly corrupted. Secondly, this maketh as much againſt the prayers of the liuing for vs, as of the dead: for when we deſire our Neighbour to pray for vs, therein we deſire him to be our mediatour, in the ſame manner as we deſire the Saints. Thirdly, Chriſt is our Mediatour, in that he gaue (17) himſelfe a redemption for all, in that he ſatisfyed the infinite Iuſtice of God for the ſinnes of the world: which kind of Mediation is only proper to Chriſt; Saints only are our Mediatours, in that they pray for vs: and ſo as Chriſt is ſayd to be our (18) Aduocate with the Father; and yet in a ſecondary ſenſe, we make iuſt men liuing, alſo our Aduocates; ſo the ſame may be ſayd of Mediatour, and ſo Moyſes ſayd of himſelfe (19) *I was an Arbiter, and Mediatour betwixt our Lord and you at that tyme*; to which words S. Paul alluding, ſayth (20) of the old law, that *it was ordayned by Angels in the hand of a Mediatour*, viz. Moyſes.

(16) 1. Tim. 2. 5.

(17) Ibid. ver. 6.

(18) Epiſt. Io. 2. 1.

(19) Deut. 5. 5.

(20) Gal. 3. 19.

S. Cyril (21) proueth that Moyſes according to the Scriptures, and Ieremy, and the Apoſtles, and others be *mediatours*. And if the name of *Sauiour* and *Redeemer* be in the Scriptures (22) giuen to men without derogation to him, who is in a more excellent and incomparable manner the only *Sauiour and Redeemer of the world*, why may not there be many *Mediatours* in an inferiour degree, to the onely and ſingular Media-

(21) L. 12. Theſaur. c. 10.

(22) Iudic. 3. 9. 2. Eſd. 9. 27. Act. 7. 35. 1. Tim. 4. 16.

Mediatour? S. Bernard ſayth, (23) *We haue need of a mediatour to Chriſt the Mediatour, and there is none more for our profit then Mary.* S. Baſil in the ſame (24) ſenſe deſireth the Mediation of our B. Lady, the Apoſtles, Prophets, and Martyrs, for procuring of Gods mercy and remiſſion of his Sinnes.

Laſtly, M. Perkins (25) granteth that the Saints departed, pray generally for the whole Church: wherfore by the lyke argument, they make themſelues Mediatours, and ſo offer iniury to Chriſt, which is moſt abſurd to ſay, and blaſphemous.

A fourth Obiection is vrged by reaſon of thoſe words of the Apoſtle, (26) *Let no man ſeduce you willing in the humility and Religion of Angels, walking in the things which he hath not ſeene.* Anſw. This place condemneth the hereſy of (27) Simon Magus, who following the Platoniſts, taught, that certaine Angels were to be adored as leſſer Gods, by whom he thoght the world to be made, and by whome the higheſt God who is inuiſible, was only to be pacifyed: which Errour the ſaid Hereticke had from Plato, who taught that *Spirits* (which he calleth *Damones*) were to be honoured as Mediators next to God. Againſt which (28) S. Auſtine diſputeth, and condemneth (29) the ſame vndue worſhip. S. Hierome (30) expoundeth this alſo of *ill Spirits, or Diuels*, whome he proueth (out of S. Steuens ſermon Act. 7.) that the Iewes did worſhip. Theodoret (31) declareth, that the Iewes defended their ſuperſtition towards Angels, by that the law was giuen by them, deceiptfully inducing the Colloſſians both to keep the law, and to honouring of the Angells, as the giuers of the ſame. Whereby diuers of the faythfull were ſo ſeduced, that they forſooke Chriſt and his Church, and committed Idolatry to the ſayd Angells; againſt which abhominations the Councell of Laodicea made a (32) Decree. (33) Tertullian expoundeth this place of falſe teachers, that feigned themſelues to haue Reuelation of Angels, that the law ſhould be kept touching difference of cleane and vncleane meates. (34) Haymo ſaith further, that ſome Philoſophers of the Iewes and ſome of the Gentils taught, that there were 4. Angells Preſidents of the 4. Elements of mans body, and that in

(23) *Ser. Signum magnum.*
(24) *In Conc. Nycen. 2. Act. 4.*
(25) Perkins in his Ref. Cath. p. 259.
(26) *Coloſſ. 2. 18.*
(27) See S. Chryſoſtome *in hunc locum. Epiphan. her. 22.*
(28) *De Ciuit. l. 8. 9. 10.*
(29) *L. 10. Confeſſ. c. 22.*
(30) *Ep. 10. ad Algaſiam*
(31) *In hunc locum.*
(32) *Cap. 35.*
(33) *L. 5. cons. Marcion.*
(34) Vpon this place.

in feigned hypocriſy (which the Apoſtle calleth here humility) they pretended to worſhip by Sacrifice the ſaid Angels. So many wayes is this Obiection ſatisfyed.

Fiftly, ſome obiect (35) that of S. Mathew, (36) *where God biddeth vs to come to him:* as alſo that of S. Luke, (37) *to aske and it ſhalbe giuen vs:* and that of S. Iohn, (38) *And if we aske the Father any thing in Chriſt his name, he will giue it vs*, & ſo directeth vs to pray, (39) *Our Father which art in heauen &c.* Anſw. Theſe places as much forbid the prayers of the liuing, as of the dead: and becauſe prayer requireth diſpoſition in the party praying, which yet he alwayes hath not, therfore God Almighty (the former places notwithſtanding) directeth vs to ſeeke help by the prayers of others, whereof ſee in Iob (40) & Geneſis (41), and ſundry other places. Beſydes, when we pray to Saintes, we do thereby the better (they being better able and more worthy by reaſon of their perfection, to obtaine any thing at Gods hands then we) come vnto God himſelfe, and more effectually pray vnto him. And as for the *Pater noſter*, it doth no more prohibit praying to Saintes, then to God the ſonne, and God the holy Ghoſt.

(35) Rogers Doct of the Art. art. 22. p. 128.
(36) 11. 28.
(37) 11. 9.
(38) 16. 23.
(39) 6. 9.
(40) 42. 8.
(41) 20. 17.

Add yet in further ſatisfaction of this ſo frequently obiected; He that giueth to one of the Kings Counſaile or Chamber, his Petition directed to the king, intreating him earneſtly, that he will exhibite the ſame to his Maieſty, and further his ſuite, doth not therby deferre the Kings honour to his Seruant, nor deſire his ſuite to be granted by the ſeruant, but by the king. The Gentiles which came to Philip and asked him (42) ſaying, *Sir, we are deſirous to ſee Ieſus*, did not aſcribe Chriſtes honour to Philip, though they came vnto him firſt, and with great humility called him, *Dominum, Sir*, and made their deſire knowne vnto him: neither did Chriſt reproue them, for not comming immediatly vnto him, as therby iniurious to him, but rather taught that this did more illuſtrate his glory, ſeeing the Gentiles had him in ſo great reuerence, as that they durſt not come into his preſence, but by the Mediation and Commendation of his beloued Apoſtles. And ſo *Phillip telling Andrew*, and *Andrew and Phillip telling Ieſus*; *Ieſus anſwered them ſaying, The houre is come,*

(42) 12. 21.

that the ſonne of man ſhalbe glorifyed. The Centurion (43) alſo not thinking himſelfe worthy to come to Chriſt, ſent vnto him the Ancient of the Iewes, deſiring him to come and heale his Seruant. And yet the holy Ghoſt affirmeth by S. Matthew, (44) *That the Centurion came vnto him &c. And Ieſus ſaid to him, I will come* &c. *And the Centurion making anſwere, ſaid, Lord I am not worthy &c.* And yet it is playne, that this Dialogue paſſed betwene Ieſus and the Centurions (45) friends, and not with the Centurion himſelfe. And this practice of the Centurion was ſo gratefull to Chriſt, that he ſaid, *Amen, I ſay to you, neither in Iſrael haue I found ſo great fayth.* Yea God directed Iobs friends ſaying, (46) *My fury is wrath againſt thee, and againſt thy two friends* &c. *Take therfore vnto you 7. Oxen, and 7. Rammes, and go to my Seruant Iob, and offer holocauſt for your ſelues, and my ſeruant Iob ſhall pray for you; his face I will receyue, that the folly be not imputed to you.* So impertinent is this Obiection ſo often inculcated.

(41) *Luc. 7. 7. 3.*

(44) *Mat. 8. 5.*

(45) *Luc. 7. 6.*

(46) *Iob. c. 42 7. 8.*

Sixtly it is obiected, the Saintes in heauen can merit or obtayne nothing for themſelues, much leſſe for others. Answere. Though as then they cannot merit, yet through the merits of their life paſt, they may obtayne what they aske, either for themſelues or others.

(47) *L. 16. de ratione vera reformationis Eccleſiæ*, and Melanct hon *in Apol. art. 21. Conf. Auguſt.*

Caluin (47) obiecteth that many are inuocated, who whether they be Saintes, or whether any ſuch euer were, no certaine hiſtory doth confirme, as Chriſtopher, George, Catharine &c. I anſwere, though the hiſtories of ſome Saintes be Apocryphall and vncertaine, yet therof it doth not follow, that ſuch Saintes were not. Of the calling of the Apoſtles we read in the Ghoſpell, but of the lyfe and death of many of them, we fynd litle or nothing; and many things which are related of them out of Abdias and others, are not approued as altogeather certaine. Beſides though the hiſtories of ſome three or foure be doubtfull, yet of the reſt they are moſt certaine: and what Saintes of all Sectes Prot. haue regiſtred into their Kalendar, let Fox beare witnes.

(48) *Hier. cont Vigil. c. 3. init.*

Some vrge with Vigilantius, that (48) whileſt we liue, we may pray for one another, but after we are dead, the prayer of none is to be heard for another, eſpecially ſeeing

Martyrs

Martyrs (49) expecting the reuenge of their bloud, cannot obtayne it. But S. Hierome anſwereth hereto in theſe wordes, *If the Apoſtles and Martyrs whileſt they were liuing, could pray for others, when yet they were carefull for themſelues; how much more after their Crownes, victories, and triumphes? Moyſes alone obtayned of God pardon for ſixe hundred thouſand armed men: and Stephen &c. begged pardon for his perſecutors: and ſhall they be of leſſe power, after they ſhall begonne to be with Chriſt? Paul the Apoſtle affirmeth 276. ſoules to haue bene pardoned to him in the ship; and after being diſſolued, ſhall begin to be with Chriſt, ſhall be then ſhut his mouth & ſhall he not be able to mutter for them, who all ouer the world haue believed at his preaching? Shall Vigilantius a liuing dog, be better then be a dead lyon?* And the very like is taught by S. (50) Auſtine. And as for that of the Martyrs, it is moſt falſe to ſay, that the Martyrs here were not heard, nor their Petition granted, for it was granted to be fulfilled in tyme appointed by God (whereunto they did and do alwayes conforme themſelues) for it was ſaid to them next after, *That they ſhould reſt yet a litle tyme, till* &c. And Chriſt our Sauiour ſpeaking of this very caſe, ſayth, (51) *And will not God reuenge his Eleƈt that cry to him day and night* &c? *I ſay to you that he will quickly reuenge them.* But if God do not ſometymes grant requeſts of the Saintes, yet it doth not therfore follow, that they do not, or may not pray for vs, for Chriſt himſelfe prayed to his Father to remoue the bitter Cup of death from him, and yet it was not granted.

(49) *Apoc. 6.10.*

(50) *Ser. 19. de Sanctis.*

(51) *Luc. 18. 7.*

CHAP. XVII.

The true State of the Queſtion, concerning the vſe & reuerence to be exhibited to Images of Chriſt, and his Saintes.

Whether it be lawfull to make the Images of Chriſt and his Saints, to place them in Churches, and to exhibite any honour or reuerence vnto them: or that all this is Superſtition and Idolatry, contrary to the Commandement of God.

SECT. I.

Catholike Doctrine.

WHAT the Church of Chriſt belieueth and practiſeth concerning Images, theſe Generall Councells following will cleerly diſcouer. The Councell of Trent decreeth that, (1) *The Images of Chriſt, of the Virgin Mother of God, and of other Saints, are to be had and retayned eſpecially in Churches, and that due honour and worship is to be imparted vnto them: not for that any diuinity is to be believed to be in them, or vertue, for which they are to be worshipped; or that any thing is to be begged of them, or that hope is to be put in them, as in times paſt the*

(1) Concil. Trident. Seſſ. 25. Decret. de ſacris Imag.

the Pagans did, who put their truſt in Idols: but becauſe the honour which is exhibited to them, is referred to the firſt patterne which they reſemble. So that by the Images which we kiſſe and before whom we vncouer our heads and kneele we adore Chriſt and his Saintes, whoſe likenes they beare, we reuerence that which is ratifyed by the Decrees of Councels, eſpecially of the ſecond of Nice, againſt the Impugners of Images

In which ſecond Nicene Councell it is ſaid (2) *We define in all certainty and diligence that as the figure of the pretious &c. Croſſe, ſo the venerable and holy Images are to be ſet forth &c. in the holy Churches of God in Sacred Veſſels, garments walls, tables, houſes and wayes: namely the Image of our Lord and Sauiour Ieſus Chriſt, as of our vnſpotted Lady, the holy Mother of God, and of the honourable Angells, and all Saintes and Holy Men; for the more often they are ſeene by Images, the more thoſe that behould theſe are more cheerfully elenated to the memory and deſyre of the Prototypon, and to giue the kiſſe, and honourable worship vnto them; but not to giue true Latria &c. which belongeth only to the Diuine nature.*

Agreably herto the Catholicke Church (3) now teacheth, that Images of Chriſt and his Saintes are not prohibited by the Scriptures to be made, or to be placed in Churches, or howſes, or to be honoured: but it likewiſe teacheth that no Confidence is to be placed in them, or any thing to be asked of them, but only that they be honoured for thoſe whom they repreſent vnto vs.

Pointes Diſputable.

Some (4) Schoolmen teach, that the Images of God are not to be made, and that they are rather permitted, then approued by the Church: But others (5) thinke it very probable, that the ſame is lawfull.

Some (16) affirme, that an Image is not in any reſpect to be worſhipped in it ſelfe, but only relatiuely for the Exemplar: (7) Others auouch that the ſame honour is due to the Image, and the Exemplar: (8) Others yet are of opinion that the very Images are to be honoured in themſelues, and

(2) *Act. 7. See Conc. Senon. Decret. 14.*
(3) *Bellar de Imag. c. 7. &c. Rhem. Teſt. in 1. Ioan. 5. 21.*
(4) *Abulenſis in c. 4. Deutr. q 5. Durand. in 3. Diſt. q. 2. Peteſius de Tradit. part. 3 in Tract de Imagin.*
(5) *Caiet. in 3 part q. 25. art. 3. Cathe-rin. l de cult. Imag. Sanderus de cult. Imag.*
(6) *Alex. 3. part. q. 30. art. 12. vlt. Durand. l. 3 Cent. Diſt. 9. q. 2.*
(7) *S. Th. 3. part. q 25 art. 3. S. Bonau. and others in 3 Diſt 9.*
(8) *Peteſius l. de Tradit. Tract. de Imag. Sander. l. 2. c. vlt. de Imag.*

properly, but with leſſer honour then the Exemplar it ſelfe. None of theſe opinions are defyned by the Church.

Proteſtant Vntruthes.

(9) *Inſtit. l.1. c.11. §.13.*
(10) *L. pro Imaginibus, qui habetur poſt 7. Synod. circa fin.*
(11) *Cent.4. c.13. Col. 1447.*
(12) *Inſtit. l.1 c.11. §.10.*
(13) *Exod.32. Iudic.18.3. Reg.12. Dan. 3. Sap.13.*

Caluin (9) auoucheth that during the tymes of the firſt 500. yeares, there was not any pictures placed in Churches. But (10) Adrianus 1. proueth at large the contrary, from the teſtimonyes and practiſe of Siluester, Damaſus, Celeſtinus, Sixtus, Leo and others, who all liued before the yeare 500.

The (11) Centuriſtes affirme that Chriſts Picture was broken and caſt downe with a *thunderbolt for a teſtimony that ſuch ſuperſtition, wherewith any vertue is aſcribed to Images, doth not pleaſe God*: But all hiſtories teſtify that not Chriſtes, but only Iulian the Apoſtataes picture, was ſo caſt downe with a Thunderbolt.

Caluin (12) alſo teacheth that the Iewes and Gentiles did not call their Idols, Gods: but this is diſproued by many expreſſe places of (13) Scripture.

Proteſtant Doctrine.

(14) Article 22.
(15) *In c.7. Deut tom.3. fol.41.*
(16) *De Vera & fal. Relig. c.de Statuis.* Peter Martyr *in loc. tit. de cult. Imag. 22.* Calu. *Inſtit. l.1 c.11. §.13.*
(17) *Apud Zwing. tom. 2. fol. 631. 630.*

The Engliſh Prot. Church decreeth that (14) *The worſhipping and adoring of Images is a fond thing, vainly inuented, and grounded vpon no warrant of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the word of God.* Heer all honour vnto them is denyed.

Other Prot. prohibit their placing in Churches. Luther ſayth, (15) *I do not much loue Images & I would not haue them placed in the Church.* Zwinglius (16) *Images ought to be abolished in Churches.* Others yet proceed further teaching that Images are not ſo much as to be made. Hoffmã ſayth, (17) *That Goodman thinketh that Images may be kept and made, ſo that one do not adore them or worship them. But this Opinion fighteth with teſtimonies of Scripture, in which the Lord commandeth that we do not make them.* So that according to Prot. Images muſt not be honoured, nor placed in Churches, nor ſo much as made.

Pro-

Proteſtants agree with Ancient Hereticks.

Nicephorus writeth, (18) *Xenaias firſt (O audacious ſoule, and impudent mouth!) vomited forth that ſpeach, That the Images of Chriſt, and thoſe who haue pleaſed him, are not to be worshipped.* According to which the Prot. Functius confeſſeth, that (19) *Xenaias firſt rayſed war in the Church againſt Images.* Iulian the Apoſtata (20) caſt downe the Image of Chriſt, which the woman (21) mentioned in the Ghoſpell had made. (22) Mahomet alſo impugned Images and the Croſſe. And *Probianus* alſo (23) denyed veneration of the Croſſe. We haue ſeen next before that the ſame is taught by the Prot. Church.

(18) *Hiſt. l.16.c.27.*
(19) *Comment. in præcedent. Chron. l.7. Anno Chriſti.494.* See *Cedrenus in compend. hiſt.*
(20) *Sozom. l.5.c.20. Euſeb. l.7.c.14.*
(21) *Mat. 9. 20.*
(22) *Alcoran, c.15.17. Prateolus verb. Mahomet.*
(23) *Hiſt. tripart. l.2.c.19.*

Proteſtant Errours.

Nappier bluſheth not to write, (24) *The ſigne, or Croſſe which appeared in viſion to Conſtantine with theſe words, in hoc ſigno vinces, in this ſigne thou ſhalt ouercome, was the firſt publick and viſible marke of Antichriſt.* So that the badge, or marke of Antichriſt, who is to be ſuch a one as doth directly oppoſe himſelfe againſt Chriſt, muſt be the *ſigne* or *Croſſe* which hath alwayes bene holden the badge of Chriſt, in regard of his dying vpon the *Croſſe*.

(24) Vpon the Reuel. p. 89. 90. 214. 215. 219. and Propoſition 31. p. 71. 73. &c.

SECT. II.

It is proued by Scriptures, that it is lawfull to make the Images of Chriſt, and his Saints, to place them in Churches, and to exhibit honour, or reuerence vnto them.

FOr the progreſſe, and fuller vnderſtanding of this Controuerſy, we are firſt to obſerue, that the words *Image* & *Idol*, are taken in the Scriptures, and with Eccleſiaſticall writers in different ſenſes: an Image is a true repreſentation or

or likenes of a thing, as whē we paint a man, a horſe &c. An *Idol*, is a falſe ſimilitude which repreſenteth that which truly is not, as the ſtatues of Venus, of Minerua, which repreſent women-Gods who neither are, nor can be Gods. The holy (1) Scripture calleth the ſonne of God, the *Image of his Father:* Salomon is ſaid to make Images of *Cherubims*; (2) but neuer is the ſonne of God called the *Idoll* of God, or the *Images* of Cherubims called *Idols*; wheras an *Idoll* is ſaid to be a (3) *falſe Image*, and S. Paul ſayth, (4) *We know that an Idoll is nothing in the world, and that there is no God but one:* Yea through the whole Scriptures, (5) the word *Idoll*, as alſo in the Fathers, (6) it is taken for a falſe God, and Idolatry for the worſhipping of falſe Gods, and ſo they are ſtill taken in the worſe part, & forbidden: Wherby is diſcouered the falſhood of Stephanus (7) affirming the word εἴδωλον to be vſed by Eccleſiaſticall writers for any Image, repreſenting that which we may worſhip, including therin the Images of Chriſt, and his Saintes. In like manner the word *Simulachrum*, deriued of *ſimulo, to diſſemble*, or lye, is vſed for *Idoll*, for where the Latin Interpreter hath *ſimulachrum*, (8) alwayes in Greeke it is εἴδωλον.

But of theſe who confound *Image* and *Idol*, I would demand when the Scriptures ſay, (9) *God ſayd, Let vs make man to our Image. And God created man to his Image: to the Image of God he created him.* (10) *Adam liued 130. yeares, & begat to his owne Image and likenes, and called his name Seth.* (11) *Man ought not to couer his head, becauſe he is the Image and glory of God.* & the like; I demand whether in theſe places the words *Image* & *Idol* do ſignify one & the ſame thing or no? if they affirme, then they muſt acknowledge of neceſſity, not only Adam when he begat his Sonne Seth, to haue made to himſelf an Idol, but alſo that man is the Idol of God, & that God when he created mā framed to himſelfe an Idol, and ſo nothing remayneth, but that they likewiſe proclayme God to be an Idolater: if they deny, then their retractation of their former aſſertion, is laudable, and we ſhall heerafter in this expect their ſilence.

Secondly, all agree, that to make or keep an Image, is not of it ſelfe vnlawfull, the Artes of painting and carving being

(1) *Coloſſ* 1.15 *Heb.* 1.3. *Sap.* 7 26.
(2) 3. *Reg.* 8. 7. 8.
(3) *Abac.* 2. 18. ſee S. *Hier. in hunc loc. & in* c. 13. *Zachar.*
(4) 1. *Cor.* 8. 4.
(5) 3. *Reg.* 7. 36. *Leuit.* 19. 4. *Num.* 23. 21. *Oſe.* 6.
(6) *Synodus* 7. *Act.* 5. 7. *Orig. ho.* 8 *in Exod.* Theodore *quæſt.* 38. *in Exod.*
(7) *In his Theſaurus. V.* εἴδωλον.
(8) *Pſ.* 113. 12. *Act.* 15. 29. 1. Io 5.
21. S. *Aug. in Pſ.* 135. *Hier. in* c 7. *Oſe.*
(9) *Gen.* 1. 26. 27.
(10) *Gen.* 5. 3.
(11) 1. *Cor.* 11. 7.

ing allowable, and the ſame practiſed and permitted amongſt Prot. themſelues.

The firſt thing therfore in queſtion is, whether it be lawfull to make the Image of God himſelfe, or of the B. Trinity? To which I anſwere, that though the ſame be not ſo certaine a matter of faith, as the other of the making of the Images of Chriſt and his Saintes is, yet the lawfulnes therof may ſundry wayes be proued. Firſt, God hath bene pleaſed to appeare, & to haue bene ſeene in corporall ſhape or figure, as appeareth in ſundry places of Scripture, as firſt, (12) where it pleaſed him to be heard walking and ſeene of Adam, and Eue in Paradiſe after their fall, and to hould a long Conference and Expoſtulation with them touching their ſinne, and the occaſion therof, therby to draw them to repentance, and to ſaue them, all which was not done without ſome forme, or ſhape by God aſſumed. (12) Gen. 3. 8.

Secondly, Iacob flying from the face of his brother Eſau, had a viſion wherin he ſaw (13) *A ladder ſtanding vpon Earth, and the top therof touching heauen, & the Angels of God aſcending & deſcending by it, and God leaning vpon the ladder, ſpeaking vnto him ſaying, I am the God of Abraham thy Father, and the God of Iſaac, the land wheron thou ſleepeſt, will I giue to thee, and thy ſeed*; the which ſenſible ſight and hearing of God by Iacob, could not be had without ſome ſhape aſſumed by God, wherby he might be ſeene and heard. And elſwhere (14) it is recorded that *a man wreſtled with him vntill morning, which man was God*, as appeareth by theſe wordes, (15) *If thou haſt bene ſtrong againſt God &c.* and himſelfe confeſſeth the ſame afterwards (16) ſaying, *I haue ſeene God face to face, and am yet alyue.* Whece it is euident, that God vouchſafed to appeare in ſhape of man, when he wreſtled with Iacob. Thirdly, (17) *God appeared vnto Abraham in the valey of Mambre, as he ſate in the doore of his Tent, in the very heate of the day: & when he had lifted vp his eyes, there appeared to him three men ſtanding neere vnto him &c.* Here it euidently appeareth by the contexte of the whole Chapter, that it was God that appeared to Abraham in ſhape of man, as by his promiſing of a child to Sara, & by the Communication paſſing betwene God and Abraham, touching (13) Gen. 28. 12. 13. (14) Gen. 32. 24. (15) Ib. 28. (16) Ib. 30. (17) Gen. 18. 1. 2. 3.

the deſtroying of Sodome.

(18) *Gen.* 3. 8. & 18. 13. *Exod* 33. 23. *Iſaiæ* 6. 1. 3. *Reg.* 22. 19. *Amos.* 9. 1. & 7 7. *Dan.* 7 9.

Fourthly, you ſhall read in diuerſe other places (18) of holy Scripture, where God hath appeared and bene ſeene by men, *walking, leaning, ſtanding, ſitting,* with deſcription of *head, hayre,* and *garments,* mentioning alſo his *ſeat, throne, and footſtoole,* which could not be done without the aſſuming of ſome bodily ſhape. And God *the holy Ghoſt* aſſumed the ſhape of a *Doue* (19) when he deſcended from heauen, and lighted vpon Chriſt at the tyme of his Baptiſme in Iordan. Angels alſo being incorporeall, haue appeared often in *mens* (20) *ſhapes.* Now as God and Angels haue appeared in theſe corporall ſhapes, ſo may they in like manner be painted; there being no iniury to draw them in thoſe formes and ſhapes, wherin they were pleaſed to appeare to men.

(19) *Mat.* 3. 16.

(20) *Gen.* 18. 2. 19. 1. *Iſa.* 6. 6. *Dan.* 9. 21. *Matth. vlt.* 1. *Luc. vlt.* 4. *Io.* 20. 12.

The ſecond queſtion is, whether it be lawfull to place Images in Churches, and that alone without any hiſtory pertayning therto. To this I anſwere, God himſelfe commanded Angels to be placed in the higheſt places of the Temple, for ſo you ſhall read, where he ſpeaketh thus vnto Moyſes, (21) *Two Cherubims alſo thou ſhalt make of beaten gould, on both ſydes of the Oracle, let one Cherub be on the one ſyde, and the other on the other; let them couer both ſydes of the Propitiatory, ſpreading their winges, and couering the Oracle, and let them looke one towardes the other, their faces turned vnto the Propitiatory, wherwith the Arke is to be couered, wherin thou ſhalt put the Teſtimony which I will giue thee: thence will I command, and will ſpeake to thee ouer the Propitiatory, and from the middeſt of the two Cherubims which ſhalbe vpon the Arke of the Teſtimony, all things which I Command the Children of Iſrael by thee.* Againe concerning the renewing of theſe Cherubims, at the building of the Temple by Salomon, you ſhall read thus of him, (22) *And he made in the Oracle two Cherubs of Oliue trees, of ten Cubits in height, one wing of a Cherub of fyue Cubits, and the other wing of a Cherub fyue Cubits, that is, hauing ten Cubits from the end of one wing to the end of the other wing: of ten cubits alſo was the ſecond Cherub, in like meaſure, and the worke was one in both Cherubs, that is to ſay, one Cherub had the height of ten cubits, and in like manner the ſecond Cherub: and he put the Cherubs in the middeſt of the Inner Temple, and*

(21) *Exod.* 25. 18. 19. 20. 21. 22.

(22) 3. *Reg.* 6. 24. 25. 26. 27. 28. 29.

and the Cherubs extended their winges, and the one wing touched the wall and the wing of the ſecond Cherub touched the other wall: and the other winges in the middle part of the Temple touched eth other. He couered alſo the Cherubs with gold; and all the walles of the Temple round about he graued with diuerſe engrauinges and caruing: and he made in them Cherubs and Palme-trees, and diuers pictures as it were ſtanding out of the wall, and comming forth. Caluin cannot deny the forſaid placing of thoſe pictures in the Temple, & yet he affirmeth them to be made, (23) *Who endeauour to defend the Images of God and Saintes, by the example of Cherubims.* But if by the appointment of God, the two Cherubs were made, which were the Images of Angels, and by God alſo commanded to be placed within the Tabernacle, before the building of the Temple, and within the Temple after the building therof, and if both Tabernacle and Temple were then vnto the Iewes places conſecrated to Gods worſhip, as our Chriſtian Churches are now; then followeth it neceſſarily, that it is as lawfull now to make Images, and to place them in the Churches, as it was then lawfull to make Cherubs and other pictures, and to place them in the Tabernacle and Temple, and that without all hiſtory therto, as theſe were; nay, which is more, this was done in the tyme of the old Teſtament, when the Iewes were moſt prone to Idolatry. Neither may we greatly feare any great inconuenience now a dayes to enſue, by placing Images in Churches, ſeeing there is none ſo ignorant, who belieueth not in one only God, and knoweth perfectly that Images and Pictures, are but the handy workes of men, & this the rather through the care and induſtry of their Paſtours, who are ſtrictly charged (24) and commanded to informe the more ignorant, of the right and lawfull vſe therof, and of that honour which is proper to God alone, not to be communicated to his Creatures: Yea inſteed of hurt, many commodities aryſe therby, as to thoſe who cannot read, and the more vnlearned, (25) inſtruction and knowledge, to all a better (26) and more frequent remembrance of Chriſt and his Saintes, and of their ſingular vertues and actions, and therby a more feruent deſire in vs, (27) to loue and imitate the ſame; and laſtly an exhi-

(23) *Inſtit. l. 1. c. 12. §. 3.*

(24) *Concil. Trid Seſſ 25.*

(25) *Greg. Nyſſen. orat. in Theod.*

(26) *Greg. Mag. l. 7. Ep. 109. & l. 9. Ep. 9*

(27) *Greg. l. 7 Ep. 53.*

exhibition (28) of due honour to God and his Saints, it being vndoubted, that to erect ſtatues and Images to great perſonages, was euer done for their greater honour: and ſome (29) thinke this the chiefeſt cauſe, why Chriſtians deſired the Images of Saints.

(28) Synod 7. act. 6. & Baſil. Orat. in 40. Martyres.

(29) Euſeb. Hiſt. l. 7. c. 14.

The third, and greateſt difficulty or queſtion is, whether any worſhip or reuerence may be exhibited to Images? I anſwere, though they may not be honoured with Inuocation, or by placing any confidence in them, yet otherwiſe that they may be worſhipped in reguard of them whome they repreſent vnto vs, is proued firſt by the former places of Scripture concerning the Cherubims and the braſen Serpent (30), which was the (31) figure of Chriſt: for the Images of Cherubims placed vpon the Arke, were neceſſarily adored of them who adored the Arke. In ſo much that S. (32) Hierome ſayth, *The Iewes in tymes paſt did worship the Holyes of Holies, becauſe there were the Cherubims, and Propitiatory, and the Arke of the Teſtament, Manna, Aarons rod, and the golden Aultar.* And the *Braſen ſerpent* by Gods Commandement placed on high could not but be worſhipped of them, who by looking thereon were immediatly cured. In ſo much that (33) S. Auſtine ſpeaking of certayne Religious ſignes which deſerue worſhip, gineth example in the *Braſen ſerpent.* And it is a certayne Rule that, (34) profitable ſignes ordayned by God, (ſuch as the Cherubims and braſen Serpent were) are to be honoured, ſeeing their honour paſſeth to the firſt patterne or exemplar, the Angels and Chriſt. Caluin confeſſeth that, (35) *The braſen Serpent was a shaddow, figure, and ſimilitude of Chriſt.* And that it was *a ſigne of ſpirituall grace.* And that, (36) *the Arke was the Image of God.* Now that the Iewes did exhibit great honour to theſe, the (37) Scriptures are manifeſt. And Caluin confeſſeth that, (38) *The braſen ſerpent was layd vp as a precious treaſure, and diligently preſerued many ages in the Sanctuary of God:* Wherby it appeareth that they were greatly honoured.

(30) Num. 21. 8. 9.

(32) Io. 3. 14. 15.

(32) Hier. in Ep. 17. ad Marcellum.

(33) Aug. l. 3. de Trinit. c. 10.

(34) Aug. l. 3. de doct. Chriſtiana c. 9.

(35) In Num. 21. 8.

(36) In Pſal. 105. 19.

(37) Ioſ. 7. 6. 2. Reg. 6. 12 &c. Num. 21. 8.

(38) In Num. 21. 8.

Secondly, the ſame may be proued by ſuch places as teach that Creatures may be honoured for the relation they haue to God, as (39) *Sweare not at all; neyther by heauen, for it is the throne*

(39) Mat. 5. 36.

throne of God, neyther by the earth: where note that an Oath being an Act of Religion, wherby firſt God, and then that wherby we ſweare is honoured, God forbiddeth Oathes by heauen or Earth without due circumſtance, leaſt thoſe creatures as they haue relation to him, ſhould thereby be diſhonoured: ſo alſo it is ſaid, (40) *Adore the footeſtoole of his feete,* where by, *footeſtoole*, is vnderſtood the *Arke of God*, according to that of King Dauid, (41) *I prepared a houſe where the Arke of our Lord ſhould reſt, and the footeſtoole of our God*: which alſo might be further proued by ſundry other places of Scripture. Now if this Arke being but a Creature, was ſo highly had in (42) reuerence for the relation it had to God, why not Images who haue a neerer and more perfect relation?

(40) *Pſ.98.*

(41) *1. Paral. 28.2 & Pſal. 131 7.8.2. Reg.6.2.*

(42) *Ioſ. 3.3. 4.5 6.2. Reg. 6.19.2. Reg. 6. Hebr.6. 4.*

Thirdly, the ſame is taught by ſuch places as teſtify that Creatures are ſayd to be ſacred, or holy, for the relation they haue to holy things; ſo to Moyſes it was ſayd, (43) *Put thy ſhoes of thy feete, for the place whereon thou ſtandeſt is holy ground*; which whether it be called *holy* for the preſence of God, or of ſome Angell, is all one. The day of the (44) *Paſſe-ouer* was commanded to be kept an holy feaſt, for the ſignification it had, and for the dedication thereof to God. The garments of the Prieſts were called (45) *holy veſtments*, for that they were ordained for the ſeruice of God. The (46) *Scriptures* are called *holy Scriptures*, in that they are ſignes of holy things.

(43) *Exod. 3.5.*

(44) *Exod. 12.14.*

(45) *Exod. 28.4.*

(46) *2. Tim. 3.15.*

Concerning the reuerence due to the ſacred name of *Ieſus*, though S. Paul ſayth thereof, (47) *For the which thing God alſo hath exalted him, and hath giuen him a Name which is aboue all Names, that in the Name of Ieſus euery knee bow, of the celeſtialls, terreſtrialls, and infernals*: and though the Ancient (48) Fathers do from this place exhibite much reuerence to the ſayd Name, yet Caluin trembleth not to ſay, to vſe his owne words, that, (49) *The Sophiſters of Sorbon are more then ridiculous, who gather from this preſent place, that the knees is to be boured, as often as the name of Ieſus is pronounced; as though it were a coniuring word, which had all it force included in the ſound.* But by this more the ridiculous impudency & blaſpemy, Caluin rãketh himſelfe among the falſe Prophets, whereof God complaineth, ſaying, (50) *who will make my people to forget my Name, through their*

(47) *Philip. 2.9.*

(48) *Conc. Lugdun. 2. cap. Decret. de immunit. Eccl. in Sexto Orig. ho. 2. in Ioſue.*

(49) *In Philip. 2.9.*

(50) *Ierem. 23.27.*

their dreames, which euery one telleth to his neighbour: as their Fathers forgot my name for Baal. And it sheweth plainly that Caluin vttered these words by the suggestion of the Diuell, for as S. Paul obserueth, (51) *No man speaking in the spirit of God, sayth Anathema to Iesus, and, no man can say our Lord Iesus, but in the holy Ghost:* whereas those who are guided by the holy Ghost do bow and reuerence at the name of Iesus, not for the sound or syllables of the word, as Caluin foolishly pretendeth, but for the relation which it hath to Christ our Sauiour. And I verily thinke, that when due reuerence is giuen by hat and knee at the hearing of our Kings name, when it is read in Proclamations, or otherwise, not one Caluinist in England durst censure the Kings name, for a word magicall, in regard of the honour done vnto it. Now it is euident, that in what respect a thing is sayd to be sacred, holy, or to haue any Excellency in it, in the same it may be worshipped and reuerenced: therefore Images hauing as perfect relation to holy things, as the earth, dayes, garments, or words, may truly be sayd to be sacred or holy, and so also may be worshipped.

(51) 1. Cor. 12 3.

Fourthly, the Images of Kings may be worshipped with Ciuil honour, therefore the Images of Christ and his Saints with Religious honour, the things represented being sacred, as the other are ciuil. And whereas the (52) Centuristes reply, that the Kings Image is therefore worshipped, by reason of the Kings absence, who cannot at the same tyme be in all, or sundry partes of the kingdome: this is most idle and false; Idle, because the question is not, why, or for what cause the kinges image is worshipped, but whether it be to be worshipped: false, for as it were greater indignity to iniure the kings picture in his owne presence, then in his absence, so to honour it in his presence, were most gratefull.

(52) *Cent. 8. c. 9.*

(52) *Euseb. hist. l. 9. c. 10. Chrysost. hom. 2. & 3. ad populum Antiochenum. Theodor. hist. l. 5 c. 20. See Calu. inst. l. 4. c 17. §. 33. Pet. Mart. in 1. Cor. 11.*

Further, an Image is capable of iniury (53) and reproach, therfore also it is capable of honour and worship. And Idols or Images of false Gods are therfore despised & detested, because they are the Images of false Gods; therfore by the contrary, Images of Christ and his Saintes, signifying true and holy thinges, may therfore be honoured.

But

But to proceed further concerning the vſe of ſacred Images: if the vſe of them were vnlawfull, either it muſt be, becauſe the vſe therof were of its owne nature diſhonourable to God, or elſe for that it is forbidden by ſome Commandement. Touching the firſt part, that it is not diſhonourable to God, is proued thus: Howſoeuer God alone is to be adored with diuine honour, yet withall a Religious worſhip is due to ſuch things, as haue relation to him, or to his Saintes, accordingly as M. Iewell confeſſeth, ſaying, (54) *We only adore Chriſt as very God, but we worſhip alſo and reuerence the Sacrament, we worſhip the word of God, we worſhip all other like things, in ſuch religious wyſe to Chriſt belonging.* And Caluin confeſſeth of the Eucharitt, as it is a figure of Chriſts body and bloud; (55) *dignam eſſe quæ omni reuerentia exaltetur, worthy to be extolled with all reuerence.* In this ſenſe Saint Iohn Baptiſt thought himſelfe (56) *vnworthy to vnlooſe the latchet of Chriſtes ſhooes*, a thing other wiſe by him not regarded, but as hauing relation to Chriſt. Alſo it was commanded, that the Arke or Mercy-ſeat ſhould be adored. (57) *Adorate ſcabellum pedũ eius*, for ſo both Fathers & Prot. read, *worſhip yon the footeſtoole of his feete.* And this honour done and giuen to Creatures being commanded by God to be giuen to creatures, neyther is nor can be diſhonourable to God, for it reſteth not in the foreſaid things themſelues, but paſſeth ouer from them, as both (58) Iewel and (59) Hoſpinian expreſſe, ſaying, *The Sacraments be adored, but the whole honour reſteth not in them, but is paſſed ouer from them to the things ſignifyed*; and heerunto Saint (60) Auſtine agreably ſayth, *qui veneratur vtile ſignum &c. he that worſhippeth a profitable ſigne ordayned by God, the force and ſignification whereof he well vnderſtandeth, doth not reuerence that which he ſeeth, but that rather vnto which ſuch ſignes haue relation.* This point is ſo euident and free from all danger of Idolatry, that Danæus debating the ſame with Bellarmine, confeſſeth in plaine termes concerning the worſhiping of Images by him defended. (61) *It confeſſeth vpon ſo many obſeruations and reſtrictions, that the honour which they exhibite to their Images, is (as he thinketh) indeed none, as being only cultus reductiuus, non proprius, that is, a worſhip reductiue or belonging to the firſt patterne,*

(54) Reply againſt Harding, p. 379.

(55) *Inſtit. l. 4. c. 17. §. 33. Edit. Gal.*

(56) *Luc. 3. 16.*

(57) *Pſ. 98. 5.*

(58) In his Reply. p. 409.

(59) *Hiſt. Sacram. l. 5. c. 8. p. 477.*

(60) *De Doctr. Chriſt. l. 3. c. 9.*

(61) *Primæ partis altera parte. p. 1383.*

not

not proper or abyding in the Image, as giuen to is for it ſelfe.

This is yet made more plaine by Example of that ciuill reuerence which we do exhibite before the Princes Image, or cloath of Eſtate: wherof S. Athanaſius ſaith, (62) *He that worshippeth the kinges Image, doth therin worship the king himſelfe.* And S. Baſil (63) thinketh of the Honour done to the King, and his Image, *that it is one, & not many, or diuerſe, & that therfore the honour* (64) *done to the Image, is referred to the firſt Exemplar.*

(62) Ser. 4. cont. Arrian. and ſee the like in S. Ambr. ſer. 20. in pſ. 118.
(63) Baſil. de Spiritu ſancto ad Amphilochium, c. 18.
(64) Baſil. Ibid. vt ſupra.

Vpon this ground it is to be imagined that *Antichriſt* (who will ſtriue to *be* (65) *exalted aboue all that is called God*) will yet in further ſatisfaction of his proud humour, cauſe his *Image* (66) to be adored; which thing he would neuer do, if the honour done to his Image were a diſhonour to himſelfe. By all which it is euident, that the vſe of ſacred Images, and the Religious worſhip done to them, by the Catholicke Church, is not of its owne nature diſhonourable to God.

(65) 2. Theſſ. 2. 4.
(66) Apoc. 13. 5.

Concerning the ſecond point, namely, whether any law or precept be made againſt the worſhipping of Images: If any were, it were that of Exodus, (67) *Thou ſhalt not make to thy ſelfe any Idoll, or ſimilitude:* but this Commandement vrged ſo much by Prot. againſt the vſe of ſacred Images, is altogeather impertinent; firſt, for that by *Idoll, and ſimilitude* here mentioned in the Precept, is meant the falſe reſemblance of that thing for God, which indeed was not God, & which the Iewes being prone to Idolatry, did groſly worſhip as their God, according to the error of the Gentils. And this is proued by S. Paul, ſaying, (68) *We know that an Idoll is nothing in the world:* and ſo likewiſe did the Fathers (69) vnderſtand the word Idoll. The Prophet Abacuc alſo calleth it (70) *a falſe Image*; or as the Prot. (71) tranſlate it, *a teacher of lyes*, that is, a repreſentation of that which is not: wherfore this Commandement maketh nothing againſt the vſe and worſhip of ſacred Images. And D. Whitguift confeſſeth, that, (72) *We cannot fynd in all the Scriptures, where God hath made any Law or ordinance, againſt his owne Commandement.* And therefore had God almighty by his Commandment forbidden

(67) 20. 4. 5.
(68) 1. Cor. 8. 4.
(69) Orig. ho. 8. in Exod. Theodor. q. 38. in Exod. Hieronymus in c. 2. Abacuc. & in c. 13 Zach. 11.
(70) C. 2. 18.
(71) Engl. Bib. of 1578.
(72) In his Def. againſt. Cartwright. p. 542. verſus fin.

den the making of ſuch Images as did ſignify a Truth, he would not then, as afterwardes he did, (73) haue commanded them to be made and erected.

(73) *Exod.* 25 18. & *Num.* 21. 8.

And let our Prot. vnderſtand whatſoeuer they will, by *Idoll and ſimilitude* here, yet is it manifeſt, that therby is only forbidden the worſhipping of them for God, as appeareth by all wordes and circumſtances of this place, as where it is ſaid there next before, (74) *Thou ſhalt haue no other Gods before me*: and after, *Tou* (75) *ſhall not make with me Gods of ſiluer and Gods of gold*: and yet more plainly, (76) *You ſhall make none Idols, or grauen Images, &c. to bow downe therto, for I am the Lord, and my* (77) *glory I will not giue to another, neither my praiſe to grauen Images.* All which argue, that therby is forbidden that kind of honour which is only due to God, and which of its owne nature was forbidden and diſhonourable before the publiſhing of this Commandement.

(74) *Exod.* 20. 3.
(75) *Exod.* 20. 23.
(76) *Leuit.* 26. 1.
(77) *Iſa.* 42. 8.

But ſuppoſe that the Iewes had bene forbidden generally to make and worſhip Images in any ſort, yet had this Commandement bene but temporall, and peculiar vnto them, in reguard of their danger and ſtrong inclination to Idolatry: and ſo accordingly Martin Luther, and Brentius affirme, as Beza witneſſeth of them, (78) *That the ſecond Commandement of the firſt Table concerning Images, pertayned only to the Iewes, as being part of the Ceremoniall Law.*

(78) *Vide Reſp. Bezæ ad acta Colloq. Montiſ. parte altera Praf. p. 12 poſt med.*

Vpon all theſe Premiſes the Concluſion is. 1. That ſince by the Proteſtantes confeſſion, the Image of Chriſt may be made: 2. ſince likewiſe for the direction of our vnderſtanding, the Image of Chriſt is the ſame to our eye, that the ſound or name of Ieſus is to our eare: 3. ſince alſo, a Religious kind of reuerence is to be exhibited at the name of Ieſus, and as M. Iewell and Hoſpinian haue affirmed, to Sacramentes, and to all other like things in ſuch religious wiſe to Chriſt belonging: ſince as M. Iewell (79) and Hoſpinian (80) further ſay as before, and the other premiſſes argue, the forſaid honour reſteth not in them, but is ſafely without all danger of Idolatry, or diſhonour paſſed ouer from them to the thinges ſignifyed; that therfore the Image of Chriſt and of his Saintes, as they may be lawfully made,

(79) *In his* Reply. p. 409.
(80) *In Hiſt. Sacram. l. 5. c. 8. p. 477.*

ſo alſo vpon the forſaid ground they may be ſafely worſhipped. The concluſion of all which is no other, but that Chriſt and his Saintes may be worſhiped in their pictures, no leſſe then Chriſt is in his name and Sacraments, and no leſſe then an Earthly King is in his Image, or Cloath of Eſtate. As for the forſaid Commandement, it is cleere by the premiſſes, that therby is only forbidden, not ſuch forſaid worthip, as not being of its owne nature diſhonourable, ſhould then firſt become vnlawfull by force of that Commandement, but ſuch worthip as was then before of it owne nature vnlawfull, in reguard wherof that Commandement was publiſhed: this, as appeareth by the premiſſes, was then only Idolatry, which became not euill becauſe it was then prohibited, but then was prohibited, becauſe it was before that, euill.

Laſtly it is to be obſerued how impiouſly Prot. corrupt the ſacred Scriptures in hatred to holy Images: And heerin of very many to touch but ſome few; Wheras S. Paul ſayth, (81) *No couetous perſon, (which is the ſeruice of Idols) hath inheritance &c.* Fulke tranſlateth, *nor couetous perſon, which is a worshiper of Images.* &c. And for (82) *Auarice, which is the ſeruice of Idols,* he ſaith, *Couetouſnes, which is worshiping of Images.* And yet in our common phraſe of ſpeaking, we ſay, ſuch a rich man maketh his money his God, euen as S. Paul ſaid of others, (83) *whoſe God is the belly.* And wheras S. Iohn ſayth (84) *Keep your ſelues from Idols,* though Fulke tranſlateth in the text, *Idols,* yet he putteth in the Margent, *or Images:* and the Church walls ſtill ſay, *Keep your ſelues from Images.* But not content with this, ſometimes they adde the word, Image, to the text, when it is neither in the Latin or the Greeke, as may be ſeene in Fulke Act. 19. 35. and in the Engl. Bib. of Anno 1562. in 2. Paral. 36. 8. I omit ſundry ſuch like, only for breuity.

(81) *Eph. 5. 5.*

(82) *Col. 3. 5.*

(83) *Philip. 3. 19.*

(84) *1. Io. 5. 21.*

SECT.

SECT. III.

That the Ancient Fathers expound the Scriptures for the lawfull vſe of Images, and Religious Reuerence done vnto them, agreably with Catholikes.

SAint Athanaſius in iuſtification of this Doctrine writeth thus (1) *God forbid, and let it be farre from vs, that we Chriſtians adore Images as Gods, as the Greekes do. We declare only our affection, and the care of our loue towards the figure of the perſon expreſſed, by his Image: therefore oftentymes we burne as vnprofitable the wood which erſtwhyle was an Image, if the figure be worne out. Therefore as Iacob when he was to dye, adored the top of Ioſephs rod, not honouring the rod it ſelfe, but him who held the rod: ſo we Chriſtians do no otherwiſe adore Images, but euen as moreouer, when we kiſſe our Children and Fathers, we declare the deſire of our mynd. Euen as the Iew alſo did adore in tymes paſt the tables of the Law, and the two golden Cherubims, and certayne other Images, not worshipping the nature of the ſtone or gold, but our Lord who commanded them to be made.*

(1) *Ad Antiochum Principem. c. 38.*

With S. Athanaſius agreeth Tertullian ſaying, (2) *And therefore he forbidding the ſimilitude of all things to be made, which are in heauen, and in Earth, and in the waters, he doth shew the cauſes reſtrayning, to wit, the ſubſtance or matter of Idolatry; for he addeth afterwards, you ſhall not adore them, nor ſerue them: but the figure of the braſen Serpent which our Lord commanded Moyſes afterwards, did not belong to the title of Idolatry, but to remedy and helpe thoſe, who were infeſted by the ſerpents. And I ſay nothing of the figure of the remedy (to wit the Croſſe) ſo both the golden Cherubims & Seraphims &c.*

(2) *L. 2. Cont. Marcionem. c. 22.*

The Fathers were ſo full for our Catholicke vſe of Images, as that they allowed the publicke placing of them in Churches, though Fulke thinketh this to be (3) *againſt the Commandement.* For ſundry examples and teſtimonies of the Ancient Fathers are in proofe therof alleadged by the Prot. (4) Parker, Chemnitius, and the Centuriſtes. In ſo much

(3) *Def. of the Engl. Tranſlat. c. 3 p. 119.*

(4) *Againſt Sym. Ortog. part. 1. p. 32. Chem. Exam. part 4. p. 26, 29, 30 Cent. 4. Col 409.*

much, that in respect of such publick allowance of *Images*, the Prot. Functius affirmeth, that, (5) *Anno* 494. *Xenaias was the first in the Church that stirred vp war against Images.*

(5) *Lib. 7. Comment in præced. Chronol. at anno 494.*

And wheras Prot. pretend, that we Catholickes do take away the second Commandement, S. Austine affirmeth this part of the Commandement, *Thou shalt not make to thy selfe any grauen thing*, not to be a seuerall distinct Precept of it selfe, but parcell of (and therfore explayned by) this former, *Thou shalt not haue strange Gods.* In this he writeth so largely and plainly, & his Iudgment is so confessed, that Musculus speaking of Catholickes sayth, (6) *They diuide the preceptes of the first table into three, and of the second into seauen, and so they leaue out the Commandement concerning Images, and grauen thinges, following Austine, who l. 2. quæst. super Exod. c. 71. appointeth three Precepts to the first table, and the other 7. to the second.* Willet also confesseth, *that* (7) *Austine would haue but 3. Precepts in the first table.* And againe, (8) *The Romanistes opinion is, that there are but 3. Commandements in the first table, putting the 2. first into one &c. of this opinion is Austine, quæst 71. in Exod.*

(6) *Loc. com. de Decalogo. p. 39.*

(7) *Comment. vpon Exod. in c. 20. p. 325.*

(8) *Ibid. p. 314.*

And whereas S. Austine taught this our Catholike Principle, that (9) *The honour giuen vnto profitable signes appointed by God, passeth from them to the thing signifyed*, Hospinian affirming that Sacraments may as signes be honoured, sayth euen as we say of Images (10) *That honour flayeth not in them, but passeth from them to the things which are signifyed*: in proofe whereof he alledgeth S. Austine, saying, *Those things which Austine writ, de doct. Christ. lib. 3. c. 9. do agree with these: Who adoreth* (sayth he) *a profitable signe appointed by God, whose power and signification he vnderstandeth, doth not honour that which is seene or passeth, but rather that whereunto all such things are to be referred.* This place is so pregnant, that it is therefore alledged to the same purpose by Peter (11) Martyr.

(9) *De Doct. Christ. l. 3. c. 9.*

(10) *Hist. Sacram. part. 2. l. 5. c. 8.*

(11) Defence de Euchar. loc. 1. col. 382.

In further proofe yet of *Images*, let vs see what honour the fathers gaue to the *Croße*. Perkins acknowledgeth that, (12) *Paulinus Ep. 12. saith, The Bishop of Hierusalem yearely at Easter set forth the Croße for the people to worship, himselfe being the chiefe of the worshippers.* Now Paulinus according to Osiander, (13) *was familiar with Hierome, Austine, and Ambroße.* Danæus auoucheth

(12) *Vol. 2. p. 596.* and Fulke aga. Hesk. p 657.

(13) *Cens. 5. l. 3. c. 2.*

that

that Cyril and ſundry other learned Fathers (14) *were plainly ſuperſtitious and blinded with this enchantment of the Croſſes adoration.* Burges confeſſeth that, (15) *there is nothing aſcribed to the Croſſe in or out of Baptiſme, by the rankeſt Papiſts, but the Fathers are as deeply engaged in the ſame: ſo as if we will vſe it as the Fathers did &c. we take the Soule to be fenced with croſsing of the Body, and the Croſſe to haue vertue of conſecrating the Sacrament, dryuing away Diuels, witchcraft &c.* In proofe whereof he alledgeth ſundry Ancient Fathers, and the like is acknowledged by other (16) Proteſtants.

Directly contrary to all Puritanes, and the more vſuall practiſe of Proteſtants, S. Auſtine teacheth that, (17) *vnleſſe the ſigne of the Croſſe be applyed, whether to the foreheads of the beleeuers, or to the water wherewith they are regenerated, or to the oyle wherewith they are annoynted, or to the Sacrifice wherewith they are nourished, none of theſe are rightly adminiſtred.* The Centuriſtes reciting this ſaying, affirme that, (18) *He ſpeaketh ſuperſtitiouſly.* And D. Fulke acknowledgeth that, (19) *Indeed S. Auſtine in Ioan. Tract. 118. ſayth, that the ſigne of the Croſſe was a Ceremony vſed in all the Sacraments, which if it were not vſed, nothing of them is duly done:* with whome agree other Prot. reproouing S. Auſtine for his Catholike doctrine of the ſigne of the Croſſe. And yet S. Chryſoſtome (liuing in the ſame age with S. Auſtine) giueth like teſtimony for the Greeke Church ſaying, (20) *All things which help to our ſaluation are perfected by the Croſſe for whē we are regenerated, the Croſſe of our Lord is preſent, when we are nourished with the moſt ſacred meate, when we take Orders euery where and alwayes that enſigne of victory is at hand.* So vſually and generally was the ſigne of the Croſſe vſed, by the Fathers in the Adminiſtration of the holy Sacraments.

And as concerning the *ſigning of our foreheads* with the ſigne of the Croſſe S. Auſtine ſayth, (21) *The people are marked in their foreheads with the ſigne of our Lords Paſſion, in preſeruation of their ſafety.* And he auoucheth, that, *Chriſt* (22) *would not haue a ſtarre to be his ſigne in the forheads of the faithfull, but a Croſſe.* Yea ſpeaking of himſelfe and his owne practice, he glorieth of the Croſſe in theſe wordes, (23) *I am ſo far from being aſhamed of the Croſſe, that I do not keepe the Croſſe of Chriſt in a hidden*

(14) 1. part. alt. part. ad Bellar. 5. controu. Reſp. p. 1415. and Parker de Symbol. part. 2. c. 7. p. 61.

(15) In Couels Anſw. to Burges. p. 130 136.

(16) Cent. 4. Col. 302. and 1493. Treatiſe of the ſigne of the Croſſe. p. 22.

(17) In Euang. Ioan. Tract. 118. See alſo de Temp. ſer. 181. c. 3. ſer. 19. de Sanctis.

(18) Cent. 5. c. 6. Col. 657.

(19) Againſt Rhem. Teſt. in 1. Cor. 11. 34.

(20) In Matth. ho. 55.

(21) Conf. Fauſt. Man. l. 22 c. 30.

(22) In Euang. Ioan. Tract. 5.

(23) In Pſ. 140. & 46.

bidden place, but I carry it on my forhead. And ſpeaking againſt a Pagan he ſayth, (24) *Let him inſult againſt Chriſt crucifyed, let me ſee the Croſſe of Chriſt in the forheads of Kinges.* Surely all this is ſuperſtitious with Proteſtantes.

In Ioan. Tract. 16. (24) In Pſ. 141.

Now to the many miracles wrought by the ſigne of the Croſſe, and by vs obiected in this behalfe, from the Fathers, D. Couell anoucheth that, (25) *No man can deny but that God manifeſted his power, to the amazement of the world in this contemptible ſigne, as being the inſtrument of many miracles.* And Hoſpinian confeſſeth that, (26) *Auſtine telleth many true miracles done by the ſigne of the Croſſe, and the Deuill put to flight. De Ciu. Dei. l. 22. c. 8.*

(25) Anſw. to Burges. p 118. (26) De Tem. plis. p. 301.

And whereas (27) S. Auſtine, Origen, Chriſoſtome, Hierome, Hilary, Theophilact, Euthimius and Bede do teach, that at the day of Iudgement Chriſt will come, with the ſigne of the Croſſe before him, the ſame is defended by the Prot. Trig. ſaying, (28) *Guaker of famous memory ſo expounds Mathew 24. 30. And by the ſigne of the ſonne of man, he vnderſtandeth the Croſſe, theſe be his words: Moſt of the Ancient Fathers expound the Croſſe to be this ſigne &c. Alſo Thomas Cowper Biſhop of Lincolne ſayd, My Brethren, can you not endure that ſigne to be made heer vpon Earth, which before the comming of the Iudge ſhalbe conſpicuous in heauen?* Wherefore though Prot. and Diuells cannot endure the ſigne of the Croſſe, yet Chriſt, and his true ſeruants will euer honour it.

(27) Aug. ſerm de Temp. ſer. 130. Orig and the reſt in Comment. in Mat. 24. 30. (28) True Catholicke. p. 295.

SECT. IV.

That Proteſtant writers do acknowlege and allow the vſe of Images in Churches: and that due honour may be exhibited vnto them.

TO begin firſt with Wicliffiſts, Wicliffe himſelfe confeſſeth that, (1) *It is euident, that Images may be well and ill made; well, to excite, facilitate, and inflame the myndes of the faythfull, that they may more deuouth worship their God.* Agayne (2) *Therefore it is granted that Relickes, Images, and Sacraments, are with*

(1) L. 18. Ep. 4. (2) De Euchar. c. 9.

with wiſdome to be worshipped.

To come to the Huſſites, Iohn Huſſe acknowledgeth that, (3) *Although before the Image of Chriſt or any Saint, men may lawfully kneele downe, pray, ſacrifice place candles and do ſo but yet they ought not to do thoſe things in the Name of the Image but in the name of him whoſe Image it is: euen as the Image not for it ſelfe, but for the thing drawn, is to be grauen, placed, painted before men.* Perzibran alloweth their placing in Churches, ſaying, (4) *I profeſſe that Images of Chriſt and his Saintes, all ſecular indecency, in vndecent worship omitted may lawfully be had and profitably kept in the Churches of Chriſtians.* So ſuperſtitiouſly Popiſh are the Huſſites.

The Lutherans alſo are no leſſe faulty, for Doctour Luther (5) and Brentius were of opinion, that the Commandement in Exodus againſt *grauen thinges*, was but peculiar to the Iewes, and Ceremoniall. But Luther further teacheth that, (6) *The ſpirit of Images-breakers is not good, it breatheth ſlaughters and ſeditions &c. It is proued from Moyſes, that the Images of the Crucifixe, and Saints are to be permitted.* Againe, (7) *It is lawfull to keep Images, becauſe God himſelfe in the Old Teſtament commanded a braſen ſerpent to be erected, and a Cherubim at the golden Arke &c.* Beza and Iacobus (8) Andreas thought the making of Images, and which is more, euen the placing of them in the Church, to be a matter of indifferency. (9) Chemnitius is alſo of the ſame mynd, alledging Luthers teſtimony for the ſame. Bucer alſo ſayth, (10) *We do not condemne the Image of Chriſt and of his Saints.* And Brachman iuſtifyeth Images by way of demand and compariſon thus, (11) *What was the cauſe that (12) God himſelfe commanded to make two golden Cherubims &c? That therefore if it were lawfull to paynt oxen and lyons in that moſt ſacred Temple, why may it not be lawfull for vs in our Churches to haue the Images of Chriſt himſelfe, holy Angels, and of the Apoſtles?*

The (13) Lutherans yet retayne the vſe of Sacred Images in their Churches. And Beza ſpeaking of the Lutherans, maketh them as yet farre more chargeable, ſaying vnto thē. (14) *Vos autem &c. do not you, D. Luther himſelf leading you, kneele downe to your Croſſes and Images of the Crucifixe? Do you not alſo in token*

(3) *Cont. Imaginum adorationem.*
(4) *Cap. 24.*
(5) *In Beza in Reſp. ad Acta Colloq. Montisb. part. alt. Præf. p. 12.*
(6) *Contra cæleſtes Prophetas.*
(7) *De Communione ſub vtraque ſpecie.*
(8) *In Epiſtom. p. 39.*
(9) *Exam. part. 4. p. 14. & 31.*
(10) *In Centur. Epiſt. Theol. 170.*
(11) *In Centur. Exercit. Theol. Centur. 1. p. 53. poſt med.*
(12) *Exod. 25.*
(13) Fulke in his Def. of the Eng. Tranſl. of the Bibl. c. 3. pag. 109.
(14) *Ad acta Colloq. Montisb. reſp. part. alt. p. 23.*

token of reuerence, light therto in the day tyme, waxen Candles &c. and this how litle and how great soeuer it be, is it not, I pray you, externall and religious adoration, which being done vnto the Image (is not as he there telleth them to be excused) by our pretence of carrying your mynd to the Exemplar (or thing signified) for (saith he a little there before) the wiser Papists will answere, that they also exhibite this worship not to the Image of the Crucifixe, but in mind to Christ himselfe.

(15) Def. of the Engl. Transl. c. 3. p. 219.

(16) Fother by answ. to certaine obiect. pa. 83. & 53. Touchburne Antid. p 92. Bucer in Cent. Ep. Theo. p. 270. Pet. Mart. & Melanct. in Palmerus de Imag. sect. 374. 476. 471.

Fulke confesseth, that, (15) Lutherans haue still Images in their Churches, and they are therein defended by sundry other (16) Protestants.

(17) Act. Mon. p. 1472. B. ante med.

The booke of Reformation in the tyme of King Henry the eight, which was allowed amongst others, by M. (17) Latimer and Cranmer, affirmeth, (18) The worshipping of Images: which article was (19) written, and added by the Kings hand. M. Thomas Bilney affirmed, and believed in plaine termes the adoration of Images. Add that (20) Brachman confesseth, that the Papistes do not adore the Images themselues, but their first patternes. And agayne, they teach, that they do not adore the Images, but the things signifyed thereby

(18) Act. Mon. supra.

(19) Act. Mon. supra.

(20) In Cent. Exercit. Theol. cent. 2. q 19. p. 45.

Concerning the worship due to the sacred name of Iesus, which is the same to the eare, that the Image is to the eye, and being lawfull, proueth the like for Images; the same is appointed and allowed by the Iniunctions (21) made in the tyme of Q. Elizabeth, & it is defended by D. (22) Whitguise and Leonard Wright. D. Fulke granteth that, (23) Capping or kneeling at the name of Iesus, is of it selfe an indifferent thing, and therefore may be vsed &c. & that, it may be well vsed in signe of reuerence to his Maiesty. Musculus also sayth, (24) Thou mayst find those who at the naming of their King do vncouer their heads, or shew some other signe of Reuerence &c. And amongst Christians very many do make mention of God the Father, and of his sonne Iesus Christ &c. without any signe of honour and reuerence. This is playne blockishnes. Caluin cōfesseth that, (25) The Diuine Maiesty of Christ is so to be esteemed of vs in this Name, that it may gayne that reuerence vnto vs, which is due to the One and Eternall God.

(21) Art. 59.

(22) Defence aga. Cartwright. tra. 21. c. 7. p 743. Wright in his Summons for sleepers. p. 30.

(23) Ag. Rhem. Test. fol. 340.

Concerning the vse of the signe of the Crosse, Luther saith, (26) When thou risest in the morning, first thinge of all, thou shalt signe thy

thy ſelfe with the ſigne of the holy Croſſe, ſaying, *In nomine Patris, & Filij, & Spiritus Sancti. Amen.* Other Prot. giue teſtimony of the Lutherans doctrine herin, ſaying, (27) *We do not diſalow the ſigne of the holy Croſſe, if ſometimes without ſuperſtition it be freely applyed and vſed in the diuine Offices; yea if our meate and drinke be freely ſigned: for when we go to bed, or ryſe from bed, we ſigne our ſelues with the Croſſe, according to the Inſtruction of Luther, and other godly men.* M. Parker mentioneth, (28) *A Catechiſme of Lutheranes, which hath theſe wordes, Let the ſigne of the Croſſe be made in the forhead and breaſt of him that is to be baptized.* And next after he further ſayth, *Luther croſſed himſelfe euery morning, and euery euening, and is neuer ſeene painted, but praying before a Crucifixe.* And the like of Luthers practiſe is affirmed by Manlius (29) Luthers owne ſcholler. But to looke neerer home, the *Communion booke* in tyme of *K. Edward the 6.* (penned by aduiſe and approbation of *Cranmer, Latimer, Ridley*, and other *Prot. Deuines* of that tyme, and printed Anno 1549.) preſcribeth the Prieſts *ſigning* (30) *of the Sacrament with the ſigne of the Croſſe*, and the Prieſts like conſecrating the (31) *Fountayne of Baptiſme*, with the ſigne of the Croſſe.

(24) *Loc. com. in Exam. 3. Præcept. p. 59.*
(25) *In Matth. 2. 23.*
(26) *In Catechiſmo.*
(27) *Deſcriptio & ritus, caerim. Miſſæ. p. 118.*
(28) *Againſt Symboliz. part. 2. c. 2. fo. 30.*
(29) *Loc. com. p. 636.*
(30) *Fol. 210.*
(31) *132.*

SECT. V.

Obiections from Scripture, vrged by Proteſtantes againſt the lawfull vſe of Images, anſwered.

SOme obiect that of Iſay, (1) *to whom will you lyken God, or what ſimilitude will you ſet vp vnto him?* The like may be obiected out of other (2) places. Anſw. Theſe places only concerne ſuch Images, as are adored and made for Gods, as may plainly be gathered out of the ſame places. But for more full anſwere, obſerue that a thing may be painted three wayes: firſt, to expreſſe the perfect ſimilitude of the forme & nature of the thing it ſelfe, and thus only Corporall thinges can be painted, and in this ſort to endeauour to paint God, is to make a true Idoll. Secondly, to repreſent to our ſight ſome hiſtory, as God almighty walking in Paradiſe in the

(1) *40. 18.*
(2) *Iſai. 40. 5. Deutr. 14. 15. 16. Act. 17. 29.*

shape of a man, Adam and Eue naked hyding themselues amongst the trees, and the Angell in mans shape with a sword in his hand. And thus to paint, were not to represent the nature of God, or the Angell, but only by painting to exhibite that to the eyes, which another by reading the Scripture would exhibite to the eares. Thirdly, a thing may be painted without a history, to expresse the nature of the thing, not by any immediate or proper similitude as it is in it selfe, but by Analogy, or metaphoricall and mysticall signification; and so we paint Angels as young men, beautifull, bare-footed, hauing winges, thereby to expresse their strength, agility, & glory: and both these wayes may God & Angels be painted.

(1) Rogers Def. of the Art. 21. p. 120.

(4) Exod. 20.4.5. Deut. 4.15 16. Leuit 26.1. Psal. 96.7. Rom. 1. 23.

(5) De Templo Salomonis c. 29.

(6) Deut. 20.3.

(7) Deut. 4. 24. Leuit. 26. 2. Psal. 96.7. Rom. 1.23 25. Exod. 20.13. Num. 25. 1. Esa. 42. 8.

The (3) second obiection is taken out of diuers (4) places of Scripture, which seeme to forbid the making of any similitude, as, *Thou shalt not make any grauen thing, neyther any similitude &c. Thou shalt not bow downe to them, neyther serue them.* To this S. Bede (5) answereth, that heereby is as plainly prohibited the making of any Kings Image, or bowing downe therto, or to his Chayre of Estate, the wordes being generall, as the making of the Images of Christ and of his Saints, or worshipping them. Secondly, that heereby is only forbidden the making & adoring of Idols or false Gods, is manifest, euen by the place obiected, & the circumstances therof, for it is said immediatly before, (6) *Thou shalt haue no other Gods before me:* and after, *Thou shalt not bow downe to them for I am the Lord thy God:* and see the like explication els-where often set downe in the Scriptures.

Yea this place is so impertinently vrged, that Caluin as ashamed therof layth, *Moyses* (8) *only speaketh of Idols.* And a little after, *That which some foolishly haue thought, here to be condemned all grauing and Images, needeth no Confutation, seeing Moyses had no other intent, but to exempt the glory of God from all fictions, which tend to corrupt it.* And vpon that of Exodus, (9) *Thou shalt make two golden Cherubims*, he affirmeth, (10) *that they were Images that had wings, which did represent Angels.*

(8) In Exod. 20.4. Edit. Gal.

(9) Exod. 25. 18.

(10) In Exod. 25.18.

(11) Calu. Inst. l. 1. c. 11. §. 9. 10.

Some reply vnto this, that both the Iewes and Gentiles did adore their true God in their Images, (11) not thinking

king the Images to be Gods, and yet such their worship was forbidden. But the falshood of this reply is sundry wayes discovered: for first the Iewes called their Idols expresly their *Gods*, (12) and so also did the Gentiles. (13) Secondly, whereas Caluin (14) auoucheth, that the Iewes were not so vnaduised, *to forget that it was God by whose handes they had bene brought out of Ægypt*: to the contrary it is directly said of them, (15) *Thou hast forsaken God which made thee, and hast forgotten the Lord thy Creatour.* And elswhere, (16) *They made a Calfe in Horeb, and worshipped the grauen thing: they forgot God their Sauiour which had done great thinges in Ægypt*: And in another place, (17) *They haue walked after vanity, and they haue not said, where is our Lord that made vs come out of the land of Aegypt.*

Neither as Caluin (18) further pretendeth, did they make these Images that therby they might know that God was the guide of their Iourney: for if they desired a Corporall signe, they had already *a Cloud*, and *a Pillar of fyre*, which were more fit to guide them then a *Calfe*, which of necessity must be carryed: besydes no cause can be giuen why they rather made a *Calfe*, then a *Sheepe*, or other thing, but because they were accustomed to see the great God of the Ægyptians, which was a *blacke* (19) *Calfe* with white spots called *Apis*. And also in vaine had bene that choyce which Iosue (20) offered the Hebrewes, *to serue the Gods which their Fathers serued, or the Gods of the Amorites, or the true God.* And Elias (21) saying, *if the Lord be God, follow him, if Baal be he, then go after him*, therin cleerly opposeth Baal to the true God. And lastly that of Deuteronomy, (22) *They offered vnto Deuils, not to God, to Gods whom they knew not, new Gods that came newly vp.* So cleere it is, that the Iewes forsooke the true God, and committed Idolatrie in serving strange Gods.

Concerning the Heathens or Gentiles, it is also certaine that they adored in their Images false Gods, for the Prophets labouring to teach, that the Idols of gold and siluer were not God, proued the same because they could not *speake*, (23) *see &c.* which had bene in vaine, if none had beleeued the same. And though Caluin (24) and others would perswade vs, that the Heathens were not so blockish,

(12) *Exod.* 32.4. 8. 1. *Reg* 12. 28. *Iud.* 18. 24. *Ierem.* 2. 28. *Deut.* 32. 17.
(13) *Dan.* 5. 4. & *sap.* 13. 10.
(14) *Inst. l.* 2. *c.* 8. §. 9.
(15) *Deut* 32. 15. 17.
(16) *Psal.* 105. 19. 21.
(17) *Hier.* 2. 6.
(18) *Inst. l.* 1. *c.* 11 §. 8.
(19) *Cicero l.* 1. *de natura deorum. Aug. l.* 18. *de Ciu. Dei. c.* 5.
(20) *Iosue* 24. 15.
(21) 3. *Reg.* 18. 21.
(22) *Psal.* 105. 37. *Esa.* 46. 7. *Psal.* 113. 13. 14. 15. 134. 16. 17. *Abac.* 2. 19. *Bar.* 6. 7 21. 13 14.
(23) *Inst. l.* 1. *c.* 11. §. 9. *Damas Contro.* 7 *p.* 194. *Zuing Resp. ad Valent. Tom.* 1. *fol.* 247.

as to thinke there was no other God but ſtones, ſtockes &c. yet it is moſt manifeſt, that many of them were ſo blockiſh, as that they thought them to haue ſenſe, and lyfe, and to be Gods: whereunto they were moued by the doctrine of the Prieſtes, by the generall conceipt therof almoſt through the whole world, and chiefly by the cunning of the Deuill, by whoſe art the Idols ſeemed to *moue* (25) *ſpeake*, and *propheſy*.

(25) *Aug. de doct. Chriſt l.3.c.7. & ep. 49. & in Pſ 113. & de Ciuit. l 8.c. 23. Arnobius l.1.contra gentes.*

Neither maketh it againſt this, that they changed their Idols, or made new ones, or made many for one God: for with the like ignorance, that they thought them Gods, with the like they thought they might make and deſtroy them at their pleaſure: and hauing ſome in heauen, and ſome in Earth, they thought it no abſurdity, that an heauenly God as *Iupiter, Apollo* &c. might haue many leſſer Gods of the ſame nature in Earth. Laſtly, both Iewes (26) and Gentiles offered Sacrifice vnto their Idols, which is a worſhip only proper to the true God.

(26) *Exod. 32.6.8.1.Cor. 10.20.*

Thirdly the fact of Ezechias (27) pulling downe the braſen Serpent, and breaking it in peeces, is obiected againſt Images, which yet was a figure of Chriſt. The Anſwere is, The Iewes offered incenſe to it as to God, for with them it was not lawfull for any to incenſe, but the Prieſt, which ſeemeth to argue, that they ſacrificed vnto it as to God, and ſo committed (28) Idolatry

(27) *4.Reg. 18.4.*

A fourth obiection is, An Image hath neyther life, ſenſe, nor reaſon, therefore it is not capable of honour. I anſwere, This only proueth that in regard of it ſelfe, it deſerueth no honour, but it proueth not the ſame in regard of the relation which it hath to the Exemplar.

(28) *3 Reg. 12. 30. 31. 2. Paral. 28. 26. 23.*

Fifthly, ſome Images of Chriſt, or our Lady, are more for example frequented and reuerenced, then others of the ſame in other places, therefore this argueth, that we place ſome diuinity and vertue in the ſayd Images. I anſwere, the more frequẽting or reuerencing of ſome Images then others, is not by reaſon of any ſuppoſed vertue, but eyther becauſe God worketh miracles by ſome, and not by others (which alſo is the cauſe why we rather pray to one Saint then another) or elſe by reaſon of the ſanctity of the maker of ſome;

for

for ſome are thought to haue been made by our (29) Sauiour, others by an (30) Angell, others by S. (31) Luke, and other (32) holy men: or laſtly becauſe ſome do more perfectly repreſent the Exemplar then others.

Many obiect, that in fauour of Images, we take away the ſecond Cõmandement. Anſw. Though our in Catechiſmes, which are made for a briefe memoriall or abſtract of our Chriſtian fayth, we do not ſet downe all the wordes at large which are in the Bybie, as neither do we in ſundry other Points of Chriſtian Doctrine; yet hauing them in our Bibles as largely as Prot. haue, if any thing could be produced from thence, againſt Images, it were much more forcible againſt vs, then if it were in our Catechiſmes neuer ſo often. But beſides, this difficulty is further ſolued thus; (33) Some deuide the Decalogue ſo, as the Precept againſt grauen things, and the adoring of any other but one God, is all one Precept; and ſo all grauen things are not prohibited, but only ſuch are taken for a ſtrange God: and thoſe of this opinion, do make theſe two, *Thou ſhalt not couet thy neighbours wyfe*, &c, *Thou ſhalt not couet thy neyghbours goods*, to be diſtinct Precepts. Others (34) make the Precept, *Thou ſhalt not couet thy neighbours wyfe, and his goods*, to be all one, and ſo theſe deuide the firſt Precept into two, making, *Thou ſhalt not make to thy ſelfe any grauen thing &c.* and, *Thou ſhalt not adore them nor worſhip them* to be two diſtinct Precepts, and theſe conſequently thinke, that the making of Images to adore them for Gods, is only prohibited by the ſecond. Wherfore after what manner ſoeuer we deuide the Commandments, not the making or vſe of Images, but the making or adoring them for Gods, is heer only prohibited.

Decalogo. eur. med. Ioſeph. l. 3. Antiq. c. 6. 3. Orig. ho. 8. in Exod. Ambroſ. c. 6. ad Epheſ.

(29) *Euagrius l. 4. c. 26. Metaphraſtes in vita Conſtantini Magni. Damaſcen l. 2. de Imaginibus.*

(30) *Euodius l. 2. de miraculis.*

(31) *Theodorus. l. 1. Collectaneorum. Niceph. hiſt. l. 14. c. 2. Metaphr. in vita S. Lucæ.*

(32) *See Euſeb. hiſt l. 2. c. 14. Sozom. l. 5. c. 20. Damaſcen l. 2. de Imag. Athanaſ. de Paſſione Imaginis Domin. c. 4.*

(33) *Clemens Alex. l. 6. Strom. Aug. q. 78. in Exo. Ep. 119. c. 11.*

(34) *Philo l. & Hier. in*

CHAP. XVIII.

The true State of the Queſtion, concerning the Sacraments of the New Law conferring grace.

Whether the Sacraments of the New Law do truly conferre grace to the worthy receiuer, as Gods Inſtrumentall cauſes: or that they are only ſignes, and remembrances of grace receiued by Faith.

SECT. I.

Catholike Doctrine.

THE Holy Sacraments being euer eſteemed amõgſt the principall meanes whereby the merits of Chriſt are to be applyed vnto vs, and his heauenly Grace to be obtayned to the remiſſion of Sinne, and the gayning of eternall glory: what the Catholike Church in this beliueth, is cleerly ſet downe by the Councell of Trent in theſe words: (1) *If any man ſhall ſay, that the Sacraments of the new Law are not neceſſary vnto Saluation, but ſuperfluous, and that men may obtayne of God only by fayth the grace of Iuſtification without them, or the deſire of them, although all of them be not neceſſary to euery particular man &c.* (2) *Or that the Sacraments were ordayned for nourishing of fayth alone &c.* (3) *Or that the Sacraments of the new Law do not contayne*

(1) Concil. Trident. Seſſ. 7. Can. 4.

(2) Can. 5.
(3) Can. 6.

containe the grace which they ſignify or do not conferre grace it ſelfe, to ſuch as put no impediment, as though they were only externall ſignes of Grace receyued by faith, or of Iuſtice, and certayne badges of Chriſtian Profeſſion, wherby amongſt men the faythfull are diſtinguiſhed from Infidel. &c. (4) *Or if any ſhall ſay, that all Chriſtians haue power in the word, and in adminiſtring of the Sacraments &c:* (5) *Or that in the Miniſters, when they do make or giue the Sacraments, Intention is not required, at leaſt of doing what the Church doth; let him be accurſed.*

The Councell of Florence ſpeaking of the Sacraments of the new Law, *define th that* (6) *they differ much from the Sacraments of the Old Law: for they did not cauſe grace, but did figure the ſame to be giuen through the Paſſion of Chriſt; but theſe our do both containe grace, and giue the ſame to the worthy receyuers.* And the like is taught by the Councell of (7) Mogumtia. And ſo all (8) Catholikes ſtill teach, that the Sacraments inſtituted by Chriſt, are true inſtrumentall cauſes of his grace, not only ſignifying, but truly conferring the ſame to the worthy receiuer.

Pointes Diſputable.

Some (9) think that the Sacramentes produce grace by ſome qualitie ſuperadded, inherent in them, which ſome teach to be corporeall, others ſpirituall. (10) Others only by the obedientiall power of the thinges ſenſible, by which all thinges created may ſerue God inſtrumentally for any effect. Some (11) teach that the Sacramentes are only mortall Cauſes of Iuſtification: (12) Others more truly, that they are cauſes phyſicall.

Some (13) that the Sacramentes of the old law, Circumciſion excepted, do not iuſtify *ex opere operantis*, through the faith and deuotion of the Receiuer. But others (14) more probably teach the contrary.

Some (15) that Circumciſion did conferre grace *ex opere operato*. Others (16) deny it, aſcribing only that power to the Sacramentes of the New Law: and this is much more probable.

Some

(4) Can. 10.
(5) Can. 11.
(6) Conc. Florent. in Decret. Eugenij P. 4.
(7) Cap. 11.
(8) Bellar. de Sacram. l. 2. c. 3. &c. Rhem. Teſt. in Act. 22. 16. &c. in Rom. 4. 11.
(9) Paludan. & Capreol. in 4. Diſt. 1. q. 1.
(10) Scotus in 4. Diſt. 1. q. 3. Alanus de Sacram. c. 38.
(11) Ledeſmus in 4. Diſt 1. q. 1. art. 1. Camus in relect. de Sacram. and others in 4. Diſt. 1.
(12) D. Tho. 3. par. q. 62. art. 4.
(13) Magiſt. Sent. in 4. Diſt. 1.
(14) Bellar. de effectu Sacram. l. 2. c. 13.
(15) Alex. par. 4. q. 7. Memb. 7. art. 4. Bonauent. Scotus, Ledeſmus, Gabr. in 4. Diſt. 1. (16) D. Tho. 3. part. q. 70. art. 4. Capreolus, in 4. Diſt. 1.

Some (17) that a Sacrament cannot properly be defyned, ſeeing it is either, *aggregatum quoddam per accidens*, ſeeing it conſiſteth of thinges and wordes; or *Ens rationis*, if it be formally taken. (18) Others, that a Sacrament is *Ens rationis*, & *vnum per ſe*, and therfore may be defyned impertectly. (19) Others, that if a Sacrament be taken morally, it may properly be defyned, but not if it be taken phyſically.

Some (20) teach, that in the Sacraments the thing ſenſible, is the matter, whether it be thinges wordes, or both, and the ſignification to be the forme. Others, (21) that the Sacrament conſiſteth of things as the matter, and the wordes as the forme. Others, (22) that not all the Sacramentes, but only ſome do conſiſt of thinges, and wordes. Others, (23) that all the Sacraments of the new Law, do conſiſt of thinges and wordes.

Some (24) thinke that the Character imprinted by ſome Sacramentes is not any reall thing diſtinct from the Soule. (25) Others that it is a reall relation: (26) others an abſolute quality, which ſome make to be inherent in the vnderſtanding, others in the will, and others in the ſubſtance of the Soule. But theſe are all points that may be diſputed by Denines, not being defined by the Church.

(17) Ockam. Maior. Richar. in 4. Diſt. 1.
(18) Scotus Diſt. 1. q. 2.
Soto. Diſt. 1. q. 2. art. 2.
(19) Bellar. de Sacram. in gener. l. 2. c. 20.
(20) Dom. Soto. in 4. Diſt. 1. q. 1. ar. 2.
Caiet. in 3. part. q. 60. art. 6.
(21) D. Tho. 3. p. q. 60. art. 6.
(22) Durand. in 4. Diſt. 2 q. 3.
Adrian. q. 2. de Bap.
(23) Alex. 4. part. ſum. q. 8. Mem. 3. art. 2. 3.
(24) Duran. in 4. Diſt. 4. q. 1.
(25) Scotus diſt. 6 q. 9.
(26) Bellar. de effectu Sacram. l. 2. c. 19.
(27) Serm. de Baptiſmo.
(28) ibid.

Proteſtant Vntruthes.

Luther falſly ſayth of Catholikes, (27) *They are inforced to aſcribe ſo much to the Sacraments of the New Law, that they decree them to profit euen thoſe who are in mortall ſinnes. neyther ſayth or grace to be requiſite, but to ſuffice, not to haue put a barre, that is, an actuall purpoſe not to ſinne againe &c. They ſay they profit the wicked and vnbelieuers, ſo that they put not the barre, as though incredulity were not of all things the moſt obſtinate, and deadly barre of grace.* But all this is meer forgery.

He alſo accuſeth (28) *the Maiſter of the Sentences & Schoolmen*, for that they *wrote only of the matter and forme of Sacraments &c. but leaue vntouched the ſpirit, lyfe, and vſe, that is, the truth of Gods promiſe and our fayth*: But he, and they l. 4. Diſt. 4. & 9. treat at large of the fayth of the receyuer, and true vſe of the Sacraments.

He

He (29) maketh Scotus the firſt author of that opinion, *that the Sacramentes do conferre grace to him that putteth not a barre.* But the ſame was formerly taught by (30) Innocentius 3. & S. (31) Auſtine. And he chargeth (32) the Scotiſtes, not to require in the vſe of the Sacramentes, fayth, good purpoſe, or good motion of the hart. But the contrary appeareth in their owne (33) writings.

Hethuſius chargeth the Fathers of the Councell of Trent to teach that, (34) *Without externall Papiſticall Ceremonies neither the truth, nor dignity, nor efficacy of the Sacramentes to conſiſt.* But no ſuch thing is to be ſeene in the (35) Councell.

Proteſtant Doctrine.

Prot. (36) teach that the Sacramentes of the new Teſtament are no better in efficacy then were the Sacramentes of the old. And that, (37) *they be only Seales of Righteouſnes, and not workes of Grace.* In ſo much that Caluin ſayth, (38) *Whatſoeuer he hath giuen vs in the Sacramentes, the ſame the Iewes in tymes paſt receyued in theirs. What vertue ours haue, that alſo they perceyued in theirs.*

Proteſtants agree with Ancient Hereticks.

D. Whitaker confeſſeth that, (39) *The Manichees were accuſtomed to deny, ſinnes to be forgiuen and grace conferred in Baptiſme.* For which alſo they are condemned by S. (40) Auſtine Petilian the Donatiſt taught that, *The Baptiſme of Iohn and Chriſt.* were all one, for which he is impugned by Saint (41) Auſtine. The Meſſalians (42) alſo were condemned for denying to the Sacraments the power of Sanctificatiõ, which they aſcribed to prayer. The (43) Armenians taught, *That the Sacramentes of the new Law do not conferre grace*, and the ſelfſame you haue lately heard to be taught by Proteſtants.

Proteſtant Errours.

The very word Sacrament is ſo hatefull to Prot. that

(29) *In aſſert. 2. Articuli.*
(30) *C. Maiores de Baptiſmo.*
(31) *Ep. 23. ad Boniſ.*
(32) *In aſſert. 2. Articuli.*
(33) *Scotus in 4. Diſt. 4. q. 2. & q 3. & diſt. 17. q. 3.*
(34) *De erroribus Pontific. lib. 13. de Sacramentis.*
(35) See *Seſſ. 7. Can. 13.*
(36) Willet Synop. p. 428. *Muſculus loc. Com. 2. de ſignis Sacram. p. 299.*
(37) Willet. Synop. p. 145
(38) *Inſtit. l. 4. c. 14. §. 23.*
(39) *Cont. Duraeum l. 10. p. 883. Sacr. loc. com To. 2. de Bap. fol. 232.*
(40) *Cap. 40.*

Zwinglius ſayth, (44) *I greatly wish that word Sacrament had neuer bene receyued by the Germans*. And the like diſlike therof ſhew ſundry other (45) Proteſtants. In ſo much that Melanchthon in his Common Places intituleth the Chapter wherin he treateth of Sacramentes, *De ſignis, Of ſignes. We* (ſayth he) *call ſignes, that which others call Sacramentes.*

Caluin (46) is of opinion that the wordes which with the Element maketh a Sacrament, are not any wordes of Conſecration, but the Miniſters Sermon preached aloud. *I will not ſay* (ſaith (47) Luther) *what the Papiſtes ſay, that none of the Angels, nor Mary herſelfe can conſecrate: But I ſay to the contrary, that if the Deuill himſelfe ſhould come, and I afterwards know the Deuill ſo to haue crept into the Office of the Paſtor of the Church, in the shape of man, to be called to preach, and publickly in the Church to haue taught, baptized, celebrated Maſſe, and abſolued from ſinnes & to haue performed that Office according to the Inſtitution of Chriſt, then we ſhould be inforced to confeſſe, that the Sacramentes were not therfore without efficacy, but that we receyued true Baptiſme, true Goſpell, true abſolution, true Sacrament of the body and bloud of Chriſt.* He alſo teacheth in ſundry places that, (48) *All Chriſtians are Prieſts*: and produceth ſeuerall Examples (49) out of Scripture, to proue that *women may preach*. A great friend to women will Luther euer be. And ſo likewiſe to the Deuill, whom he acknowledgeth may be a Miniſter, with power to preach, baptize, ſay Maſſe, conſecrate the Sacrament &c.

Luther, (50) Caluin, and other Prot. teach, That *intention* in the Miniſter is not required in the adminiſtration of Sacraments, but that the ſame are effectuall though they be not giuen in the name of God, or ſeriouſly, but only in ieſt, or skorne.

Whitaker auoucheth that, (51) *Paul expreſly teacheth, the Iſraelites to haue had indeed the ſelfeſame Sacraments, which Chriſt hath giuen to vs.* Wherfore according to Prot. the very Iewes inioyed the ſelfeſame Sacramentes, which Chriſtians do.

SECT.

(41) L. 2. Cont lit. Petil. c. 32. 34. 37.
(42) Damaſcen. de Hæreſibus.
(43) Guido de Armentiis. Error 16.
(44) L. de vera & fal. Relig. c. de Sacram.
(45) Luther. l. de Captiuit. Babyl. c. de matrim. Carolo ſtad. l. de Imaginibus & Sacram. Caluin. Inſtit. l. 4. c. 14. §. 13.
(46) Inſtit. l. 4. c. 14. §. 4. Beza in ſumma Doct. de re Sacramentaria.
(47) L. de Miſſa priuata. & vnct. Sacerd.
(48) L. de Captiuit. Babyl. c. de ordine. In Articulis à Leone 10. dam. art. 13. l. ad Pragenſes. de inſtituendis Miniſtris Eccleſiæ.
(49) L. de Abroganda Miſſa.
(50) De Captiuit. Babyl. c. de Bap. & art. 11. à Leone damn. Calu. in Antidot Conc. Trid. Seſſ. 7. Can. 12. Chemnit. Exam. part. 2. p. 141, 154. 1043.
(51) Cont. Dur. li. 8. ſect. 9.

SECT. II.

It is proued by Scriptures that the Sacraments of the New Law do truly conferre grace to the worthy receauer.

THe efficacy which Catholikes aſcribe to the holy Sacraments may firſt be proued by the differẽce betwixt S. Iohn Baptiſts & Chriſts baptiſme. S. Iohn ſaith, (1) *I haue baptized you with water, but he ſhall baptize you with the holy Ghoſt*; heer ſo great difference is put betweene the efficacy of Iohn, and Chriſtes Baptiſme, as betweene water and the Spirit: But the Baptiſme of Iohn was ſufficient to ſtirre vp & nouriſh fayth, no leſſe then the Baptiſme of Chriſt, therin being externall ablution and the word of promiſe, for he preached not only the *Baptiſme of Pennance vnto* (2) *remiſsion of ſinnes*, but euen the (3) *fayth in Chriſt Ieſus*. (1) *Mar.* 1. 8. *Mat.* 3. 11. (2) *Luc.* 3. 3. (3) *Act.* 19. 4.

Caluin heere (4) replyeth, that the difference of theſe two Baptſmes conſiſted only in this, that Iohn was the Miniſter of the externall Ceremony, and Chriſt the Author of the internall Sanctification: but this is eaſily confuted, becauſe had it bene ſo, Iohn neyther could, nor ought to haue ſaid, *I baptize & c. he will baptize &c.* as before; but ſhould haue ſayd, *I baptize, he doth baptize*: neither would Saint Paul haue cõmanded thoſe to be baptized with the Baptiſme of Chriſt, whom he had already heard, to haue beene (5) baptized before, with the Baptiſme of Iohn. (4) *Calu. in Mat. c.* 3. (5) *Act.* 19. 3. 8. 16. 17.

Neyther will it ſuffice to anſwere with (6) Caluin, that they were not baptized againe, but only viſibly receaued the guift of the holy Ghoſt; but againſt this the text is ouer plaine; *Hearing theſe things they were baptized in the name of our Lord Ieſus. And when Paul had impoſed hands on them, the holy Ghoſt came vpon them, and they ſpake with tongues and propheſyed.* Agreable to this, when (7) S. Philip had baptized many in Samaria, S. Peter and S. Iohn comming thither afterwardes *prayed for them, that they might receiue the holy Ghoſt, for he was not yet come vpon any of them, but they were only baptized in the name of* (6) *In Act.* 19. (7) *Act.* 8. 12. 15. 16. 17.

our Lord Iesus. Then did they impose their handes vpon them, and they receyued the holy Ghost. So different thinges are *Baptisme*, & the *receiuing of the holy Ghost by the imposition of hands.*

(8) *Mar.* 16. 16. Secondly Christ sayth, (8) *he that believeth and is baptized shalbe saued.* Here saluation which is not wrought but by Iustification, and washing away of sinne, is attributed alike to *Baptisme*, and *to fayth.* To reply, that Baptisme saueth, by stirring vp faith, is insufficient; for first faith goeth before, wheras it is absurd to place the effect before the cause, euen as it were absurd to say, he that is cured, and taketh phisick &c. and so, seeing to heare the word of God, is truly the cause of fayth, therfore the same in the Scriptures is set before, as, (9) *he which heareth my word, and believeth him that sent me, hath lyfe euerlasting:* See the like (10) elswhere. Besides Christ here ioyneth not the Sacrament with *preaching*, as Protestants do, but with *fayth*, which is the effect of *preaching*: wherfore as *fayth* according to Protestantes doth immediatly iustify, by applying the merits of Christ, not by stirring vp any other cause, why may not the same be said of *Baptisme*, seeing Christ alike attributeth Saluation to both?

(9) Io. 5. 24.
(10) Io. 6. 45.

(11) Io. 3. 5. Thirdly our Sauiour sayth, (11) *Vnles a man be borne againe of water and the spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdome of God.* Here *Baptisme* is plainly made the cause of our new birth, which cannot be said, by stirring vp faith, for then it had bene false to haue said, *Vnles a man be borne againe of water* &c. seeing that *fayth*, which according to them only iustifyeth, is otherwise sufficiently without *Baptisme* stirred vp. Caluin here againe (12) answereth, that it is not spoken of the Sacrament of Baptisme, but only of internall renouation, and so the sense to be, Vnles a man be borne againe of water, that is, of the holy Ghost, who cleanseth like water. But this is Idle, for if it were lawfull thus to peruert the Scriptures, we might easily take away not only Baptisme, but all other Misteries. Secondly, water here is placed before the holy Ghost, wheras first to place the Exposition, and after the thing to be expounded, is most absurd. Thirdly the Ancient Fathers do generally (13) expound this place of the Sacrament of Baptisme.

(12) *In Comment. huius loci. & l. 4. Instit. c. 16. §. 25.*
(13) *Cypr. l. 3. ad Quirin. Ambr. l. de Spir. S. c. 11. Hieron. in c. 16. Ezech. Aug. Chrysost. & Cyril. in Comment. huius loci. Basil. Nazian. Nyssen. Ser. de Bap.*

Fourthly

Fourthly, of Baptiſme it is ſayd, (14) *Do penaunce, and be euery one of you baptized in the name of Ieſus-Chriſt for remiſſion of your ſinnes.* (15) *He hath ſaued vs by the lauer of Regeneration,* (16) *cleanſing her* (viz. the Church) *with the Lauer of water in the word.* In which places is taught, that by Baptiſme a man hath his ſinnes remitted, is cleanſed and ſaued.

(14) Act. 2. 38 & Act. 22. 17.
(15) Tit. 3.
(16) Epheſ. 5. 26. & 1 Pet. 3. 21.

Fiftly, of the efficacy of other Sacraments it is ſayd (17) *When Simon had ſeene that by the impoſition of the hands of the Apoſtles, the holy Ghoſt was giuen &c.* and agayne, (18) *I admonish thee that thou reſuſcitate the grace of God, which is in thee by the impoſition of my hands:* theſe places cannot but be vnderſtood of the Sacraments of *Confirmation* and *Orders:* And heere the *impoſitions of hands* is manifeſtly made the cauſe of the giuing of grace & the holy Ghoſt; neyther can it be ſayd, that this they do by ſtirring vp fayth, for thoſe vpon whome hands were impoſed, were already beleuers.

(17) Act 8. 18.
(18) 2. Tim. 1. 6.

SECT. III.

Reaſons in proofe that the Sacraments do conferre Grace.

SEeing the Scriptures do referre the giuing of Grace and remiſſion of ſinnes to the (19) *Godhead*, to (20) *Chriſt*, & to (21) *Sacraments*, yea vnto the (22) *Miniſters* therof, none of theſe therefore is to be excluded, but an explication is to be made, in what ſort euery one of theſe conferreth and worketh the ſame: and heer an example may be giuen in a mans writing, that as in the action thereof, the perſon of the writer is the principall Agent, his hand is the Inſtrument conioyned to his perſon, and his penne the inſtrumet ſeparated from his perſon, euery one of theſe working in *its* kind, without iniury of th'one to th'other: ſo like wiſe there is a ſemblable ſubordination in the other, the Godhead being the principall Agent, Chriſts Humanity & Paſſion being likewiſe the inſtrumental, conioyned to the God-head, and Sacraments as being the ſeparated inſtrument. Sundry Prot. writers acknowledge euery one of theſe in their (23)

(19) Luc. 5. 21.
(20) Luc. 5. 2.
(21) Io 3 5. Act. 22. 16. Tit. 3. 5. 1. Pet. 3. 21.
(22) Io. 20. 23.
(23) Chemn. Exam part. 2. p. 17. Hoſpin. loc. Theol. l. 3. p. 277. Andreas Hallamerus, in conciliat. locorum pugnantium fol. 218. 212.

degree to concurre and worke: the Godhead without dishonour to Christs Passion, his Passion without offence to his Godhead, and lastly Sacraments by grace & vertue from the Godhead and Christes Passion, and without dishonour to eyther: and vnderstanding thus Sacraments to serue only as working instruments, there is (as(24) Chemnitius cõfesseth) *reserued to God his owne glory*. And this efficacy of inward grace thus attributed to Sacraments, is no more dishonourable to God, then were the like effectes of corporall health referred to the *brasen* (25) *Serpent*, to the (26) *Pond vpon Probatica*, to S.(27) *Paules Napkins*, to S. (28) *Peters shaddow*, and our Sauiours (29) *garment*; or then was Sampsons strength being referred to the (30) *hayres* of his head, which as they were (31) *cut off*, and *did* (32) *grow* againe, so did his strength (33) *decrease*, *and* (34) *increase* accordingly.

(24) In Exa. part. 2. p. 12.
(25) Num. 21. 9.
(26) Io. 5. 2. 3. 4.
(27) Act. 19. 12.
(28) Act. 15. 16.
(29) Mar 5. 28. 29.
(30) Iudic. 16. 17.
(31) Ibid. ver. 19. 20.
(32) Ibid. 22.
(33) Ibid. 19.
(34) Ibid. 22.

And wheras it is commonly affirmed in Catholike bookes & Schooles, that the Sacraments conferre Grace *ex opere operato*, *of the worke wrought*, this phrase of speach is vsed for two reasons, as (25) *Bellarmine* obserueth: first therby to signify that Sacraments are not only signes of Grace, but also instruments instituted to worke and conferre the same. Secondly to exclude all efficacy in this behalfe from the party that worketh; whose worke (in distinction from other) is called *opus operantis*, *the worke of him that worketh*, intending heeerby, that the efficacy of Sacraments resteth not in the worthines of him that worketh, thar is, of him that ministreth or receyueth the Sacrament, but, *ex opere operato*, *of the worke wrought* in the Sacramentall action it selfe, as it is instituted by Christ to that end. As for fayth, & repentance,(36) we hould them to be needfull dispositions for our receiuing of the Sacramentall grace, and such as may not be wanting in such as are of discretion, yet it is not our fayth and repentance that worketh the Sacramentall action it selfe, as it is the Institution of Christ.

(35) De effectu Sacram. l. 2. c. 2.
(36) Bellarm. vbi supra.

The second reason, is drawne from the nature of signes, which are of two sortes, the one Theoricall, which doth only represent the obiect, not working any thing immediatly, or by its owne power, as the signe of a Taueine, or the lyke:

like: and another practicall, which worketh immediatly, & by its owne power: ſo a Seale doth not only repreſent the Image, but doth alſo impreſſe the ſame in the waxe. Proteſtantes make Sacraments only ſignes of the former kind, affirming them not otherwiſe to iuſtify, but by ſtirring vp faith. But the ſame is diſproued euidently, in that they may be rightly adminiſtred (37) to Infants, to the deafe, and to the mad, to whom to apply preaching or other ſignes only to ſtir vp fayth, were fooliſh and vayne.

(37) *Aug. l. 4. Conf. c. 4. & l. de adult. coniug. c. 26. & 28. Leo Ep. 91. ad Theodorum. Concil. Carthag. 4. Can. 76. Arauſicanum. 2. Can 12.*

Thirdly if the Sacraments be but bare figures to ſtir vp fayth, then they might eaſily haue bene ordayned by men, and haue had the ſame power; for what skilleth it, to bare ſignification, who ordayned them, ſo that they repreſent the ſame obiect; by whomſoeuer the ſigne is placed at the Inne, it repreſenteth alike. The Hebrew words written by God in the Tables, do ſignify alike with the ſame written in Hebrew, Greeke, or Latin by men: And the *Trumpets* (38) commanded by God to be made, do but in the like manner encourage to battayle, as the trumpets of the Heathens. Now it is granted by the Proteſtants that the Sacraments could not be ordained by man but only by God.

(38) *Num. 10. 2.*

Fourthly, Scraments depend of God, not only in their Inſtitution, but alſo in their vſe; for it is God who by his Miniſters doth baptize, conſecrate, abſolue &c. And this truth is generally (39) holden, and granted euen by Proteſtants: But this dependance were not needfull, if they were only bare and not working ſignes; for that words and other ſignes may only ſignify and moue the mynd by repreſentation, it is impertinent from whome they proceed, for whether the Mr. or ſeruant ſpeake the ſame words, they do alwayes ſignify the ſame thing.

(39) *Chryſoſt. ho. 83. in Mat. & Aug. Tract. 5. in Ioan.*

Fifthly, Sacraments miniſtred in Greeke or Latin, are of no leſſe efficacy then adminiſtred in the vulgar, which the party baptized, for example, peraduenture only vnderſtandeth; ſo Proteſtants admit Catholike Baptiſme, which alwayes is miniſtred in Latin. But this were falſe, if they wrought only in māner of a Sermon, which profiteth only thoſe who vnderſtand it: Beſydes the Sacraments only profit

fit those who receiue them, though many other present do see and behould the administration thereof, and yet all present may be stirred vp to fayth, the promise of God being denounced, and the visible signe put before their eyes; further, whilest the Priest sayth, *I Baptize thee*, according to Prot. he doth not say, I wash away thy sinnes, but I testify to thee, thy sinnes to be forgiuen: Now this testification profiteth not him that is baptized, according to them, but because in the meane tyme he thinketh and believeth, that God, through Christ is mercifull vnto him. But all present, may thinke and believe the same, the promise being generall: for not therfore is God propitious vnto him that is baptised, according to Protestantes, because he is baptized; but therfore the Testification of Baptisme is true, because God is mercifull vnto him, so that by fayth he apprehend this mercy of God.

Lastly if our Sacramentes be but bare signes, then they do not excell nor differ from the Sacramentes of the old law, which in the Scriptures are but little esteemed, (40) *Circumcision is nothing*, sayth S. Paul: who also calleth the Old Sacramentes, (41) *Weake, and poore Elements.*

(40) 1. Cor. 7. 19.

(41) Galat. 4. 9.

SECT. IV.

That the Ancient Fathers do expound the Scriptures agreably with Catholickes in proofe of the Sacraments conferring grace.

THe former textes of Scripture produced in proofe that the Sacraments instituted by Christ, do conferre grace, are in like sort interpreted by the Ancient fathers: of Baptisme, S. Clemens Romanus writeth thus, (1) *But you will say peraduenture, what doth the Baptisme of water conferre to the worship of God? First truly because Gods will therein is fullfilled: secondly, because the frailty of the former nativity, which came to you by nil is cut of to one regenerated of water, and borne of God, and so at last you may come to saluation, otherwise, it is impossible: for so the true Prophet*

(1) Epist. 4.

Prophet hath witnessed vnto vs with the Sacrament, saying, Verily I say vnto you, vnles a man be borne of liuing water, he shall not enter into the kingdome of heauen: and therfore make haste to these waters, for in these waters there is a certaine mercy of him, who in the beginning was carryed vpon the waters, and he acknowledgeth those who are baptized vnder the Appellation of a threefold Sacrament, and doth deliuer them from punishment to come, offering vp their Soules to God consecrated by Baptisme, as a certaine guift. Fly therfore to these waters, for they are they alone, which can quench the fury of the fyre to come: to which he which lingreth to come, it is manifest, that the Idoll of infidelity doth yet remayne in him &c.

With S. Clement agreeth Origen, saying, (2) *Much company followed Iesus vntill he came beyond Iordan, whom he also healed in those coastes of Iudea beyond Iordan, where Baptisme was giuen vnto men, and peraduenture therfore it is said of the Company following our Lord to the Baptisme of Iordan: and he healed them there, for all are truly saued from all their spirituall infirmities in Baptisme.* (3) Againe, *Therfore also Infants are baptized, because by the Sacrament of Baptisme the filthes of Nativity (or Originall sinne) are put away or clensed, for vnlesse a man be borne againe of water and of the spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdome of heauen.*

(1) Tract. 7. in Matth.

(3) Ho. 14. in Lucam.

The Councell of Nice decreeth thus of Baptisme, (4) *Our Baptisme is not to be considered with the eyes of the body, but with the eyes of the mynd. Doest thou see water? consider the power of God hidden in the waters, for the Ghospell doth teach vs, that we are baptized in the holy Ghost, and in fyre, for in the faith of the Baptizer, & in the fayth of the Baptized, by a holy Inuocation consider the waters full of sanctification of the Spirit, and of diuine fyre: for he sayth, he shall Baptize you with the holy Ghost and with fyre, therfore he who is baptized, descendeth full of sinnes, and obnoxious to the seruitude of Corruption, and he ascendeth freed from this seruitude and sinne, being made a Child of God, and heire of his Grace, and coheire with Christ, hauing put on Christ, as it is written: Whosoeuer you are who are baptized in Christ, you haue put on Christ.*

(4) L. 3. de Sanct. Bapt.

S. Hierome for the power of Baptisme writeth thus, (5) *All strumpets, and the publicke sinkes of naughty company, impiety against God, incest with Parents, and extraordinary carnall sinnes, the nature of either sexe being changed, are purged by the fountayne of*

(5) Epist. 83. ad Oceam. c. 2.

Chriſt &c. all crymes are pardoned in Baptiſme: neither is ſeuerity to be feared after the Iudges pardon, the Apoſtle ſaying, (6) And theſe thinges truly were ſome of you, but you are waſhed, but you are ſanctified, but you are iuſtifyed in the name of our Lord Ieſus Chriſt, and the ſpirit of our God, all ſinnes are pardoned well and faithfully: What efficacy Baptiſme hath, and what grace the water ſanctifyed in Chriſt hath, I will teach a little after.

(6) 1. Cor. 6. 11.

S. Gregory affirmeth that, (7) Whoſoeuer is not looſed by the water of regeneration, he is held bound with the bonds of the firſt guilt. And what with vs auayleth the water of Baptiſme, the ſame wrought only ſayth amongſt the Fathers of the Old Teſtament, either for their litle ones, or the vertue of Sacrifice for them of ripe age, or the miſtery of Circumciſion, for them who came of the Stocke of Abraham: for that euery one is conceyued with the ſinne of his firſt Parent, the Prophet teſtifyeth ſaying, (8) Behould I am conceiued in iniquityes, and in ſinnes hath my mother conceyued me: & becauſe he whom the water of Saluation doth not waſh, doth not eſcape the punishments of originall ſinne, truth plainly witneſſeth by it ſelf ſaying, Vnles a man be regenerated of water, and the holy Ghoſt, he ſhall not haue eternal lyfe.

(7) L. 4. moral. c. 3.

(8) Pſ. 50. 7.

Concerning Confirmation M. Hooker will tell vs that, (9) The Fathers euery where do impute vnto Confirmation the guifte or grace of the holy Ghoſt, not which maketh vs firſt Chriſtn men, but when we are made ſuch, aſſiſteth vs in all vertue, armeth vs againſt temptation and ſinne. And in this truth the Fathers are approued by D. Couell, (10) & by the Communion Booke turned into Latin, and printed at London Anno 1574. In ſo much that the Proteſtants are herin reprehended by the (11) Puritans.

(9) Eccl. pol. l. 5 ſect 66.
(10) Modeſt. Examinat. p. 192.
(11) Nichols in his Plea of the Innocent p. 25. Miniſters of Lincolne Dioceſſe in their Abridgment. p. 76. Carthw. in writg. Def. p 716.

Concerning the Euchariſtes conferring grace, S. Cyprian ſayth: But (12) ſince our Lord ſaid: do this in remembrance of me: this is my fleſh: this is my bloud: as often as it is done (to wit this myſtery) with theſe words, and in this faith, this ſuperſubſtantiall bread, and Cup conſecrated, and offered to God by ſolemne benediction, it auayleth for the lyfe and Saluation of the whole man, being togeather a medicine and a holocauſt, to heale our Infirmities, and to purge our iniquities.

(12) De cœna Dominj.

S. Baſil the great ſpeaking of the profit that commeth by often receyuing, ſayth: (13) To Communicate euery day, and to participate of the holy bread and bloud of Chriſt, is both amiable & very

(13) Epiſt. ad Cæſaream Patriciam.

very profitable, our Lord himselfe manifestly saying: he that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath (14) eternall lyfe; for who doubteth but the often participation of lyfe, is nothing else but to line many wayes? we therfore Communicate foure tymes euery week, Sunday, Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday, and other dayes if there shall happen any Commemoration of any Saint. (14) Io.6.54.

The like Efficacy of the Sacrament of Pennance, is taught by sundry Fathers, S. Ephrem sayth, (15) Thou art good O Lord and mercifull, and although once by rapine we haue fallen, by pennance we will study to be healed; and if like men we are violently caried away with our perturbations, let vs not to the very end cast down our Courages, but acknowledging him God who hath called vs, and the vocation wherwith we are called, let vs heare him speaking; Do (16) Pennance for the kingdome of heauen is at hand. For neither hath he limited his Pennance vpon some sinnes, and not vpon others, but for euery wound of our sinne, that great Phisitian of our Soules, hath giuen vs this great remedy. (15) De Pœnit. & Conuers. (16) Mat.3.8.

S. Chrisostome vseth these words of admiration, (17) O Pennance which forgiuest sinne God shewing mercy, and openest Paradise, which healest the contrite man, and exhilarates the heauy harted, callest life from death, restorest our state, renewest honour, giuest confidence, and reformest our strength, and powrest out most boundant grace! O Pennance, what new thing shall I rehearse of thee? all things bound thou looses, all things loosed thou makest free, thou mitigatest all aduersity, thou healest all contrite things, thou cleerest all confused things, all desperate things thou encouragest! O Pennance more glittering then gold, more bright then the sunne, which sinne doth not ouercome, nor infirmity vanquish, nor desperation blot out, or extinguish! Pennance refuseth Couetousnes, abhorreth Luxury, dryeth away fury, strengthneth loue, treadeth vnderfoote pride, conteyneth the tongue, composeth manners, hateth malice, excludeth enuy. O Pennance Mother of mercy, and Mistres of vertues, great are thy workes, wherby thou looses the guilty, & dost repayre the delinquents, helpest such as be fallen, recreatest such as despayre, by thee Christ hath designed the Kingdome of heauen appropriated for vs, saying; Do pennance, for the Kingdome of heauen is at hand. (17) Ser. de Pœnit.

Pacianus his opinion is that, (18) God would neuer threaten the vnrepentant, vnles he meant to pardon the Penitent: thou wilt say, (18) Ep.1. ad Sympron. Nouat.

say, only God alone can do this, it is true, but what he also doth by his Priests, is his power: for what is that which he sayth vnto the Apostles, (19) *What you bind vpon Earth shall be bound also in heauen &c.*

(19) Mat. 16. 19. *to what end is this sayd, if it were not lawfull for men to bynd and loose? Or was this only lawfull for the Apostles, therefore for them only it is lawfull to baptize, and to giue the holy Ghost?*

S. Ambrose teacheth that, (20) *A man baptized, if afterwards he shall become a forsaker and violater of the Sacrament he sinneth and driueth God for him: but if he do Pennance from his whole hart, where God seeth, he shall be saued; as God saw the hart of Dauid, when being grieuously reprehended by the Prophet, after Gods terrible Commination, he cryed out aloud saying, I haue sinned & immediatly he heard, God hath taken away thy sinne: how much do three syllables preuayle, for three syllables are,* peccaui, *but in these three syllables the flame of the Sacrifice of his hart ascended to heauen &c.*

(20) Exhort. ad agend. Panit.

(21) Ad c. 14 Ose.

(22) Ps. 50.9.

(23) Esa. 1. 16.

S. Hierome auoucheth that, (21) *The Nouatians call themselues pure, when as they are the impurest of all, denying Pennance, whereby sins are cleansed, according to that which is written;* (22) *Thou shalt wash me, and I shall be whyter then snow: & as it is in Esay,* (23) *Wash you, be cleane. But this lauer he calleth not Baptisme, but euery Pennance which washeth away the filth of sins.* These & sundry other places of the fathers considered, it was no small impudency for Melancthon to say, (24) *Not any one letter can be produced from the ancient writers, which doth helpe the Schoolmen in this matter.* But this is contrary to the acknowledgment of his owne Brethren: for Luther saith, (25) *But if there be any of the Fathers who hath thought the Sacraments to iustify by their owne vertue, though it be Austine, as Cochlaus contendeth, I nothing care, they are the sayings of men.* Agreably to which writeth Caluin, (26) *Peraduenture those immoderate Commendations of the Sacraments, which are read in the Ancient writers, as that of Austine &c hath deceyued* these miserable Sophisters. And agayne, (27) *Let it trouble no man that the Ancient Fathers striue to make a difference betweene the one and the other* (to wit, the Sacraments of the old Law, and New) *their authority ought not to be such as to shake the Infallibility of Scriptures &c. neyther is that quirck of Austine to be approued, that by the Baptisme of Iohn, sinnes are forgiuen in hope, but by the Baptisme of Christ, sinnes are forgiuen in deed.* And whereas S. Au-

(24) In Apol. art. 13.

(25) L. cont. Cochlæum.

(26) L. 4. inst. c. 14. sect. vlt.

(27) Instit. l. 4. c. 15 sec. 7. Chemnit. Exam. part. 2. p. 38.

stine

ſtine ſpeaketh thus cleerly, (28) *There are ſome Sacraments giving Salvation, others promiſing the Saviour. The Sacraments of the New Teſtament giue Salvation, the Sacraments of the Old Teſtament promiſe the Saviour.* This ſaying is ſo pregnant againſt Prot. as that Muſculus bluſheth not to ſay, (29) *It was ſpoken inconſiderately by Auſtine.* Swinglius ſayth, (30) *It was a great error of the old Doctours, in that they ſuppoſed the externall water of Baptiſme to be of any value, towards the purging of ſinne.* So confeſſed are the Fathers.

(28) In Pſ. 71.
(29) Loc. com p. 292. See Calu. miſſ. 1 4. c. 14. ſect. vlt.
(30) De Bap. fol. 702.

SECT. V.

That the learnedſt Proteſtants do, agreably with Catholickes, teach that the Sacraments of the New Law do conferre grace to the worthy Receauer.

THis Doctrine of the Efficacy of Sacraments conferring grace is ſo cleerly conuinced from ſacred Scriptures & holy Fathers, that many Prot. ſubſcribe to Catholickes againſt their owne brethren. Huſſe belieueth, that, (1) *The Sacramentes of the old law did not iuſtify &c. but the Sacramentes of the New Law do iuſtify.*

Haffenrefferus teacheth that, (2) *Baptiſme is not only a ſigne ſignifying regeneration, but it is the inſtrument wherby God conferreth and worketh in vs regeneration.* Iacobus (3) Andræas euidently (4) compareth Baptiſme to fayth, and referreth to them both alike the force of Iuſtification, in ſo much as he reproueth Grinæus for denying, that *the force of Iuſtification, was to be attributed to Sacramentes.* Beza is alſo charged with errour, (5) for that he affirmed it, *mere Idolatry to aſſigne any inſtrinſecall force to Sacramentes:* and in like manner he is further reprehended for vnderſtanding *Metaphorically* (6) the former Scriptures alleadged concerning Baptiſme.

(1) In Conſut. Diſp. Ioan. Iacobi Grinæi. p. 187.
(2) Ibid. ſupra, fine p. 187. 188. & 210.
(3) Iacobus Andreas in Epitom. Colloq. Montisb. p. 98. propoſit.
(4) Ibid. p. 421.

Adamus Franciſci reprehendeth the Swinglians and Caluiniſtes, ſaying of them, (7) *They dare impudently write that Baptiſme properly ſpeaking is not the laner of Regeneration, but figuratiuely by a Sacramentall Metonymia.* Chemnitius teacheth

(7) In Margarita Theol. loc. 14. de Bapt. pa. 221.

expreſly that, (8) *Baptiſme is a meane or inſtrument, by which is made a Communication of Chriſtes benefits*, and hauing produced in proofe therof the ſundry texies before alleadged, he ſayth of them, (9) *Theſe be moſt manifeſt teſtimonies, which do expreſly attribute efficacy to Sacramentes*, and that, *they are not to be peruerted* (10) *by tropes from the naturall ſenſe, which the ſignification of the wordes doth afford*. And he further explaineth this truth, ſaying, (11) *Thoſe thinges that are neceſſary to Saluation, are to be diſtinguished, as Chriſt meriting, the Father Lord* (or giuer,) *the inſtruments, or Sacramentes &c. by which the holy Ghoſt doth offer and apply thoſe benefits of the New Teſtament &c. Euery one of theſe in their manner and degree, are ordained for our ſaluation &c. It doth not follow, The Sacramentes are neceſſary to ſaluation, therfore not Chriſt alone by his merit hath gained it for vs.* The like Explanation is made by Haffenreffer us, teaching that (12) *We are ſaued by Chriſtes merit, we are ſaued by the Sacramentes, we are ſaued by fayth, a peculiar reſpect being reſerued for euery one.* Which is directly our Catholicke fayth.

In like manner Benedict Morgenſterne not only affirmeth that, (13) *Baptiſme is not only the Seale of Grace and Iuſtification, but alſo doth regenerate.* But he reproueth (14) as well Caluin for his contrary doctrine, as alſo Vrſinus, for affirming the aforeſaid textes of Scripture to be improper (15) or figuratiue.

Luther expreſly teacheth that, (16) *The Sacramentes of the New Law are not only bare ſignes, ſuch as were in the Old Teſtament, but they worke remiſſion of ſinnes, Iuſtice and ſaluation in them who vſe them with true fayth.* Againe, (17) *The Swermery Sacramentaries are to be deteſted, who eſteeme the Sacraments for externall ſignes, wherwith Chriſtians are marked, as sheepe with red roddle.*

But to omit certaine (18) others, and to come vnto ſome of our owne writers at home, one of them doubteth not to reproue his Puritane Brethren for extenuating the force of Baptiſme, (19) *Our New Reformers make no great reckoning of Baptiſme, and in that point from their Brethren the Anabaptiſtes*

(8) *Examen. Conc. Trid. part. 2. p. 52.*
(9) *Exam. part. 2. p. 20.*
(10) *Ib. prope fin.*
(11) *Exam. part. 2. p. 170.*
(12) *Loc. Theol. l. 3. p. 277.*
(13) *In Tra. de Eccleſia p 74. paulo ante med.*
(14) *Ib. Initio.*
(15) *Ib. p. 73.*
(16) *In Sermonibus Communibus, titulo de Sacramento Altaris.*
(17) *Ep. Cont Regem Angliæ.*
(18) See *Philip. Marbachius in Diſp. Theol. de ſacr. Bap. Sacram. ſect. 76. 77. 87. 96.* ſee *Lobechius Diſp. Theol. 1. p. 22. & Diſp. 15 p. 331. Sebaſtian. Schluſſelb. 230. Calu. in Theol. Caluin. l. 1. f. 58. Amandus Polanus in Partit. Theol. l. 1 pag. Inſtit. c. 22. de cœna Domini.* (19) The book intituled *Quarimonia Eccleſiæ. p. 79.*

tiſtes are wont to differ, though more fearfully, and more diffidently. D. Bilſon alſo teacheth that, (20) *Chriſt hath annexed Grace to his Sacramentes, and power to his creatures after an vnſpeakable manner*, and he diſliketh (21) them who affirme and defend, that *the Sacramentes do only ſignify, and not exhibite grace*: affirming of Children that, (22) *they are new borne of water and the holy Ghoſt*. M. Hooker alſo is ſo full and plaine (23) in this queſtion, that he is therfore reproued by a late (24) writer. I omit D. Whitguift (25) and M. (26) Cartwright.

M. D. Whitaker doubteth not to ſay, (27) *That Baptiſme is the conduit of Grace, it deriueth Chriſtes merits vnto vs: neither doth it only ſignify ſaluation but doth alſo performe and bring the ſame*: Yea he alloweth herein (28) *Alani ſententiam, the opinion of D. Allen*, affirming (29) with him that, *God doth worke grace in the ſoule of man by his Sacraments, as by an Inſtrumentall cauſe, and no leſſe truly then a man is ſayd to write by his penne*. Which Example for compariſon of writing with the *penne*, is in M. Parkins iudgment ſo pregnant for Catholikes, and ſo directly againſt the Proteſtants, that (30) he to that end mentioneth and reiecteth the ſame. D. Couell writeth thus Catholikely, (31) *That ſauing grace which Chriſt originally is, or hath for the generall good of his owne Church, by Sacraments he ſeuerally deriueth vnto euery member thereof &c. Now, Agent cauſes we know are of two ſorts. the Principall, which worketh by vertue of his forme, as fire maketh heat, and thus nothing can cauſe grace but God himſelf: the Inſtrumentall which worketh, not as the other &c. but only by that motion which it hath from the principall and firſt Agent: thus do Sacraments worke*. And ſomwhat after he therfore ſaith, (32) *For God doth iuſtify by the Sacraments. And yet further*, (33) *Sacraments paſſiuely may by the worke done afford Grace, for in that iuſtification and meanes of righteouſnes, whereof man is made partaker by the Sacraments, many things do concurre: firſt on Gods behalfe, a will, that we ſhould vſe thoſe ſenſible Elements: on Chriſtes behalfe, his Paſſion, from which the Sacraments haue their vertue &c. In reſpect of the Sacrament it ſelfe, the externall action which aryſeth out of the fit application of the matter and forme of Sacraments: Now, that which in all this actually and Inſtrumentally bringeth Grace is the externall action, which is commonly called the Sacrament*. No Catholike writeth more

(20) In his true difference betwene Chriſtian ſubiects. part. 4. p. 539.
(21) *Ibid. p.* 391.
(22) *Ib. p.* 368. *poſt med*
(23) *In his Eccl. Pol. l. 5. ſec. 57 p.* 117. 118. *& p.* 132.
(24) See the Chr. letter to the Reuerend man M. Rich. Hook. p. 27.
(25) Defence. *p.* 517.
(26) *Ibid. p.* 532.
(27) *Cont. Camp. rat. 8. p.* 684.
(28) *Cont. Duraum l. 2.*
(29) *Ib.*
(30) In his reformed Cath p. 292. 293.
(31) Defence of M. Hook, art. 14. p. 96.
(32) P. 98.
(33) P. 99.

more plainly for the *Sacraments conferring Grace*, then D. Couell.

Lobechius a Lutheran Doctour and Professour of Diuinity, is so confident in this truth, as that he explayneth the matter, and answereth the Zwinglians Obiections, (34) *The obiections made by Zwinglians* (sayth he) *are easily answered: If the Sacraments* (say they) *do conferre grace, and apply the promise of grace, & saue, then they shalbe made equall with the holy Ghost, and with the merit of Christ &c. I answere: The efficient cause of Saluation is only God, the materiall cause is only Christ &c. The Instrumentall causes by which God the Father doth communicate his grace to the faythfull are the Sacramentes &c. therefore there is a double agent cause &c. the principall and instrumentall.*

(34) Disp. Theol. & c. p. 331. 332.

SECT. VI.

Obiections from Scripture, in proofe that the Sacraments do not conferre Grace, answered.

LVther (1) obiecteth these words of Christ, (2) *He that belieueth and is baptized, shalbe saued, but he that beleueth not shalbe condemned*: From whence he argueth first thus, he that belieueth and is baptized is saued, he that belieueth not, is damned, though he be baptized: therefore not Baptisme, but only fayth saueth. Againe, Christ sayd, *He that belieueth not, shalbe condemned*, but he sayd not, he that is not baptized shalbe condemned; therefore Baptisme is not necessary to Iustification. Answ. The first Consequence is false, for from that Antecedent, is only truly inferred, that therefore, not only Baptisme saueth; for by the lyke reason I might conclude, that S. Paul affirming, (3) *Fayth without Charity not to profit*, therfore fayth nothing profiteth. To the second, Christ sayd not, He that is not baptized shallbe condemned, not that this is not most true, when it is the parties fault that he is not baptized, seeing the same Christ sayd, (4) *Vnlesse one be borne agayne of water and the holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdome of heauen*: but because it was not needfull to say it, it

(1) *In Babylon. c. de Bap. & in assert. art. 2.*
(2) *Mar. 16. 16.*
(3) *1. Cor. 13. 1.*
(4) *Io. 3. 5.*

It being of it ſelfe vnderſtood by thoſe other wordes, He that believeth not, ſhalbe condemned: for he that believeth not, conſequently will not be baptized, and although he would, yet it would not profit him. Now in the affirmation it is requiſite to add baptiſme to fayth, becauſe not euery one who believeth is baptized. Argumentes drawne thus from *genus* to *ſpecies*, are of force negatiuely, as, He is not a liuing creature, *Ergo*, nor a man: but not affirmatiuely: It is a liuing creature, *Ergo*, a man.

Some obiect all ſuch (5) textes of Scriptures as affirme, that a man is iuſtifyed by fayth, therfore (ſay Prot.) he is not iuſtifyed by the Sacramentes. Anſw. No texte affirmeth that a man is iuſtifyed only by faith, and therfore there may be place left alſo for the Sacramentes to iuſtify. For otherwiſe God and Chriſtes merits ſhould alſo be excluded from the working of Iuſtification. Wherfore as Iuſtification is aſcribed to fayth, ſo alſo is it often aſcribed to the Sacramentes, as I haue formerly (6) proued.

(5) *Habac.* 2. *Rom.* 1. *Heb.* 10. *Rom.* 4. & 10.

Zuinglius vrgeth thoſe wordes, (7) *Who can forgiue ſinnes but only God? The Phariſees* (ſayth (8) Zwinglius) *vnderſtood that God only, not the Sacramentes, cold iuſtify*: according to that, (9) *I am he that blotte out iniquities*. Anſw. It ſeemes Zwinglius deſireth rather to believe the Phariſees, then Chriſt our Sauiour: for if the Phariſees ſaid, *who can forgiue ſinnes but only God?* Chriſt alſo in anſwere therto ſaid, *but that you may know that the ſonne of man hath power in Earth to forgiue ſinnes, he ſaid vnto the Paralyticke, take vp thy bed*. And ſo alſo he ſaid vnto men, (10) *Whoſe ſinnes you ſhall forgiue, they are forgiuen them*. The wordes of Eſay are vnderſtood of him, who by his owne proper authority doth forgiue ſinnes, who is only God.

(6) See next before ſect. 2.
(7) *Luc.* 5. 21.
(8) *L. de vera & falſa Religo*
(9) *Iſa.* 43. 25.
(10) *Io.* 20. 23.

CHAP. XIX.

The true ſtate of the Queſtion, concerning the number of the Sacramentes.

Whether there be ſeauen Sacramentes inſtituted by Chriſt our Sauiour: to wit, Baptiſme, Confirmation, Euchariſt, Pennance, Extreme Vnction, Order, and Matrimony: or only two, Baptiſme, and the Lords Supper.

SECT. I.

Catholike Doctrine.

IF the word Sacrament be diſtaſtfull to ſome Proteſtantes (as I haue formerly (1) ſhewed) much more will they diſlike ſo great a number of them, as the Catholicke Church decreeth in theſe wordes: (2) *If any man ſhall ſay, that the Sacramentes of the new Law were not all of them inſtituted by our Lord Ieſus Chriſt, or that they are more, or fewer then ſeauen, to wit, Baptiſme, Confirmation, Euchariſt, Pennance, Extreme Vnction, Order, and Matrimony; or that any of theſe ſeauen are not truly and properly Sacramentes, let him be accurſed.*

(1) See before *Chap.* 18. *ſect.* 1.
(2) *Conc. Trident. Seſſ.* 7. *Can.* 1.
(3) *Decret. Eugenij P.* 4. *&c. Concil. Mogunt. c.* 11.

In the Councell of Florence it is defyned, that (3) *There are ſeauen Sacraments of the new Law, to wit, Baptiſme, Confirmation, Euchariſt, Pennance, Extreme Vnction, Order, and Matrimony &c. By Baptiſme we are ſpiritually borne againe; By Confirmation*

mation we are increaſed in Grace, and ſtrengthened in faith: being borne againe and ſtrengthened, we are nourished by the diuine food of the Euchariſt: And if by ſinne we incurre the ſickneſs of the Soule, by Penuance we are ſpiritually cured: and both ſpiritually and corporally (as is beſt for the Soule) by Extreme Vnction: By Order, the Church is gouerned, and ſpiritually multiplyed: by Matrimony, it is corporally increaſed. The opinion (4) of Catholickes is, and euer hath bene, that the forenamed 7. Sacramentes, are all of them truly and properly Sacramentes inſtituted by Chriſt. (4) *Bellarm. de Sacram. l. 2. c. 24. Rhem. Tell. in Gal. 4. 3.*

Pointes Diſputable.

All Catholickes holding the Sacrament of Confirmation; Some (5) hould, that by Diſpenſation it may not be adminiſtred by a Prieſt: but others (6) more truly teach the contrary. Some, (7) that the matter therof ſubſtantially conſiſteth in Oyle & Balme, but diſiunctiuely, as integrall partes of the matter. (8) Others, that both iointly are of the ſubſtance of the matter, and ſo of neceſſity of the Sacrament. Others (9) yet more probably, that in the Oyle conſiſteth the matter of the ſubſtance therof, and ſo is of neceſſity of the Sacrament. And that the Balme is only of neceſſity of Precept, whether Eccleſiaſticall, or from Chriſt. (5) *S. Bonauent. Duran. & Adrian. in 4. Diſt. 7.* (6) *S. Tho. 3. p. q. 72. ar. 11.* (7) *Canus.* (8) *Sotus di. 7. q. Vnico. art. 2.* (9) *Cajet. in 3. p. art. 2. Nauar. in Manuali. c. 22. n.*

Some (10) thinke, that by Precept diuine, or Eccleſiaſticall, this Sacrament is neceſſary to Saluation: Others (11) better the contrary, if contempt be wanting. *8. Victor. in ſum. de Sacram. q. 41.* (10) *Richar. Diſt. 7. art. 3. q. 1. Palud. q. 4. Silueſt. verbo, Confirmatio. n 3.*

All acknowledge Orders to be a Sacrament: ſome (12) make nine degrees, adding the degree of Biſhop, and firſt Tonſure. Others (13) add yet Singers. Others (14) only make ſeauen, & (15) others 8. adding the degree of Biſhop. Some, (16) of all theſe degrees thinke only Prieſthood to be a Sacrament. (17) Others the 3. greater Orders, excluding the leſſer. Others (18) moſt probably, thinke the greater and

(11) *D. Th. 3. p. q. 72. art. 1. & 8.* (12) *Canoniſtæ ap. Nauar. in Man. c. 22. n. 18.* (13) *Tilman. Lae Sacram c. 3.* (14) *S. Tho q. 37 art. 2. Alex. 4. part. q. 70. mem. 8.* (15) *Aliſſiodor. l. 4. Sum. c de Ord q. 1. Waldenſ. Tom. 2. de Sacrom. c. 116. Cajet. Tom. 1. opuſc. Tract. 11.* (16) *Durand. in 4 Diſt. 24. q. 1.* See *Victoria. q 116. de Sacram. & Cajet. Tom. 1. Tra 21* (17) *Sotus in 4. Diſt. 24 q 1 art. 4. Nau. in Man. c. 22 n. 18.* (18) *S. Tho. q. 37. art. 5. & l. 4. cont gent. c. 63. S. Bonauent. in 4. Diſt. 24. art. 2. q. 4.*

leſſer Orders to be a Sacrament.

Some (19) moſt probably thinke, the degree of Biſhop to be of it ſelfe a Sacrament. (20) Others thinke that it doth not differ from Prieſthood, and other Orders. Some (21) thinke that impoſition of hands, is only accidentall in the Ordination of Prieſtes and Deacons; and the giuing of the Inſtruments, to wit, the Chalice, and the Patten to the Prieſt, and the Ghoſpell to the Deacon to be only eſſentiall: But (22) others more probably, that impoſition of handes is alſo matter eſſentiall to them.

All beleiuing Matrimony to be a Sacrament, ſome (23) Schoolmen thinke, the matter thereof to be the mutuall conſent of the parties contracting, expreſſed by wordes of the tyme preſent: and the forme to be the wordes of the Prieſt, wherwith he conioyneth them in Matriage. Others (24) teach, that the parties contracting, are the matter, and their wordes expreſſing their conſent, the forme. Others (25) that the wordes of the parties contracting are to themſelues matter and forme, ſo that the wordes of the party laſtly expreſſing the conſent, are the forme, and the wordes of the firſt ſpeaker, the matter. (26) Others moſt probably, that the mutuall conſent is the matter, and the wordes or ſignes expreſſing the ſame, the forme.

Some (27) teach that the Pope may diſpenſe in Matrimony contracted but not conſummated: (28) Others deny it.

Some (29) teach that Matrimony was a Sacrament in the Old Law, with the Iewes, and ſo not firſt inſtituted, but confirmed by Chriſt: But (30) others much more truly teach, that it was firſt inſtituted by Chriſt, and doth excell in grace the mariages of the old Law.

As touching Extreme Vnction: ſome (31) thinke, that the Apoſtles did adminiſter the Sacrament of Extreme Vnction

(19) *Durand. in 4. Diſt. 24. q. 4. Palud. 19. q. 7. Nauar. in Man. c. 22 n 13.*

(20) *S. Bonau. Aluertus M. Richard. in 4. Diſt. 24.*

(21) *Dom. Soto. diſt. 24. q. 1. art. 4.*

(22) *Hoſius in Confeſſ. Polon. c. 30. Pet. Soto lect. 5. De Sacram. Ordinis.*

(23) *Canus de locis l. 8. c. 2. Gul. Parisienſis. l. de Sacramentis, Tract. de Matrim. c. 9. q. 1.*

(24) *Palud. in 4. Diſt. 26. q. 4. Adrian. in 4. q. 2. Couarruuias in Epitome l. 4. Decret. 2. part. c. 1.*

(25) *S. Tho. in 4. Diſt. 26. q. 2. ar. 1. Diſt. 1. Victoria q. 245. de Sac. Sotus Diſt. 26 q 2. Art. 4.*

(26) *Couarruuias communiter ſuper Caput, Tua nos. Extra, de ſponſalibus. Nauar. in Man. c. 22. n. 20.*

(27) *Canoniſtæ cum Gloſſa in cap. ex publico. Extra, de Conuerſ. coniug. Anton. 3 p. tit. 2. c. 21. §. 1.*

(28) *Couarru. in Epit. l. 4. Decret. 2. par. c. 7. n. 21.*

(29) *Aliqui bonl. à Caſtro l. 22. cont. Haer. verbo, Nuptiæ, hær. 3 Pet. à Soto. lect. 3. de Matrim.*

(30) *S. Tho. in 4. Diſt. 26. q. 2 art. 2. S. Bona. in 4. Diſt. 26 art. 2 q 2. Scotus Diſt. 26 q. unica Concluſ. 4.*

(31) *Th. Waldenſ. To. 2. de Sacram. c. 283. Aliqui à Caſtro, l. de hær. verbo, Extrema Vnctio.*

ction when they annointed the ſick, cured them. *Mar. 6.* but others (32) more probably teach, that this was only a figure or ſhadow therof. None of theſe differences are defyned by the Church.

(32) *Ianſen. in c. 6. Mar. Dom. à Soto. Diſt. 23. q. 1. art. 2.*

Proteſtant Vntruthes.

Caluin affirmeth, that *the* (33) *Ancient* (writers) *when they ſpeake properly, do no where mention more then two Sacramentes:* but this to be falſe is cleere by S. Cyprian (34) & S. Auſtine (35) He alſo auoucheth, that (36) *Auſtine plainly affirmeth that Impoſition of handes (or Confirmation) is nothing els but prayer.* But S. Auſtine himſelfe ſayth, (37) *The Sacrament of Chriſme, in the kind of viſible ſignes, is holy, euen as Baptiſme it ſelfe.*

(33) *Inſt. l. 4. c. 19. ſ. 12.* (34) *L. 2. Ep. 1.* (35) *Aug. l. 2. cont. Ep. Petil. c. 104.* (36) *Inſt. l. 4. c. 19. § 12.* (37) *L. 2. cont. lit. Petil. c. 104.*

Chemnitius teacheth, that, (38) *Silueſter inuented the Confirmation of Children:* But this is no where read of him. And there are Decrees (39) of Popes more Ancient then S. Silueſter, where not the Sacrament it ſelfe, but ſome other Ceremonies cõcerning the adminiſtration therof, are ordained.

(38) *Exam. ad Seſſ. 4. in fine Diſput. de Traditionibus.* (39) *De Conſecrat. Diſt. 4. Can. in Cateciſmo. & Can. Non plures. & Diſt. 5. Can. 2. 2. &c.*

Yea Chemnitius (40) himſelfe deriueth Vnction of Chriſme from Montanus, and addeth, that it was confuted by S. Hierome. But wheras many (41) Fathers do write againſt the Errors of Montanus, not one of them mentioneth or numbreth this amongſt his Errors: neither doth S. Hierome (42) in the place obiected confute any ſuch matter.

(40) *Exam. part. 2. p. 208.* (41) *Epiph. her. 48. Euſebius Hiſt. l. 4. c. 14. Clem. Alex. ſtrom. 4. Philaſtrius in Catal. Hier. Ep. ad Marcellum. Aug. her. 26. Theodoret. lib. 3. de Fab. her. Damaſc. l. de 100. her.*

Caluin (43) affirmeth, that Minor Orders are a late Inuention, no where read of but in the Sorboniſtes, and Canoniſtes. But before all Sorboniſtes and Canoniſtes, they were mentioned by S. Iſidore, (44) by the 4. Carthage Councell, by S. Hierome, by the Councell of Laodicea, by S. Cornelius, and by S. Ignatius.

(42) *Dial. cont. Lucifer.* (43) *Inſt. l. 4. c. 19. ſ. 24.* (44) *Iſid. l. 7. Etym. c. 12. Conc. Carth. 4. c. 2. ad 20. citer in c. 2. ad Tit. & Ep. ad Nepotian. Conc. Laodic. 24. Cornel. apud Euſeb. Hiſt. l. 6 c. 31. Ignat. Ep. ad Antiochenſes.*

Caluin (45) teacheth, that Matrimony was not houlden for a Sacrament before the tyme of S. Gregory: but this to be falſe is conuinced by S. (46) Auſtine. He alſo (47) affirmeth that we call it impurity and pollution: and Chemnitius

(45) *Inſtit. l. 4. c. 19. § 34.* (46) *L. de bono coniug. c. 18. & l. 2. de nupt. & concupiſc. c. 20.* (47) *Inſt. l. 4. c. 19. ſ. 36.*

nitius (48) in proofe therof alleadgeth Siricius in his Epiſtle to Himerius: but Siricius only ſpeaketh againſt Prieſtes mariages, which he calleth Sacriledge: and in the like ſenſe, that it is ſaid, (49) *Thoſe are they who with women are not defyled, for they are Virgins*, may Mariage be called impurity.

Caluin (50) vrgeth from Sigebert, that Extreme Vnction was inſtituted by Innocentius the firſt, and (51) Chemnitius by Fælix the fourth. But this Fælix liuing aboue an 100. yeares after Innocentius, Chemnitius is anſwered by Caluin; and as for Sigebert, he relateth onely that which is to be ſeene in (52) Innocentius his Epiſtle, where he affirmeth it to be a Sacrament, and alledgeth S. Iames in proofe thereof: but there is no intimation of any Inſtitution by Innocentius.

(48) *Exam. part 2. pag. 1107.*
(49) *Apoc. 14.*
(50) *Inſt. l. 4. c. 19. §. 10.*
(51) *Exam. part. 2. p. 1135.*
(52) *Ep. 1. c. 8.*
(53) *Article 25.*
(54) *See hereafter ſect. 4.*
(55) *Theodoret. l. 3. de hær. Fab. de Nouato.*
(56) *Conc. Niceu. 1 Can. 32. Arab. Conc. Arelat. 2. Can. 17.*
(57) *Optatus l. 1. cont. Parmen.*
(58) *Guido Error. 21. Armen.*
(59) *Optat. l. 2. cont. Parm.*
(60) *Theod. l. 3. de hær. Fab.*
(61) *Cyprian l. 4. c. 2. Ambroſ. l. 4. de Pœn. c. 2.*

Proteſtant Doctrine.

The Engliſh Prot. Church hath Decreed, that, (53) *There are 2. Sacraments ordayned of Chriſt our Lord in the Ghoſpell, that is to ſay, Baptiſme and the ſupper of the Lord. Thoſe 5. commonly called Sacraments, that is to ſay, Confirmation, Pennance, Orders, Matrimony, and Extreme-Vnction, are not to be accounted for Sacraments of the Ghoſpell being ſuch as haue growne partly of the corrupt following of the Apoſtles, partly are ſtates of lyfe allowed in the Scriptures; but yet haue not like nature of Sacraments with Baptiſme and the Lords Supper, for that they haue not any viſible ſigne, or Ceremony ordayned of God.* Other Prot. teach that there are 3. Sacraments, others that there are 4. others 7. all which I ſhall ſhew (54) heerafter in the Section of Proteſtants.

Proteſtants agree with Ancient Hereticks.

The Sacrament of Confirmation was reiected by the (55) Nouatians, (56) Arrians, (57) Donatiſtes, and (58) Armenians. Holy Chriſme was ſpitte vpon, and troden vnderfoot by the (59) Donatiſtes, and deſpiſed by the (60) Nouatians. The Sacrament of Pennance was denyed by the (61) Nouatians. The Sacrament of Extreme Vnction

was

was reiected by the (62) Armenians, (63) Waldenſians, and (64) Albigenſes. The Sacrament of holy Orders was denied by (65) Tandemus, and by (66) Mahomet. And Æ ius was condemned by S. (67) Epiphanius, and S. (68) Auſtine for making Prieſts to be equall in authority by Gods law with Biſhops. And the Sacrament of Matrimony was impugned by the (69) Armenians. All which hereſies were condemned by the Ancient Fathers, and writen of in thoſe tymes, and yet are all renewed by the Sectaries of theſe dayes.

(62) *Guido de hær. Arm.*
(63) *Guido de Waldenſibus.*
(64) *Antoninus 4. part. ſum. tit. 11. c. 7.*
(65) *Roberti Monteſſis in append. ad Sigobert.*
(66) *Platonius Verb. Mahomet.*
(67) *Hær. 75.*
(68) *Hær. 53.*
(69) *Alphonſus Zamorenſis. l. de Matrimonio.*

Proteſtant Errours.

Caluin (70) profeſſeth not to eſteeme *Oyle*, whether in Baptiſme or Confirmation, ſo much as a litle dunge. And (71) Chemnitius deemeth it not impious for a trauailer, hauing his bootes hardened with heate, to annoynt or greaſe them with this Chriſme. Luther is in ſuch diſlike of Extreme vnction, that he oppoſeth himſelfe againſt S. Iames ſaying, (72) *If it were Iames the Apoſtle, I would ſay it were not lawfull for Apoſtles by their owne authority to inſtitute a Sacrament &c. for this belongeth to Chriſt alone*; as though S. Iames after the receyuing of the holy Ghoſt, ſhould erre in a matter of ſuch waight, or would aſſume to himſelf what is proper to Chriſt alone: but heer you may ſee Luthers zeale and humility.

(70) In Inſt. l. 4. c. 19. §. 21.
(71) Exam. part. 2. p. 314.
(72) Lib. de Captiuit. Babylon. c. de Extrema Vnctione.

Caluin, (73) Bucer, Brentius, Chemnitius, and other Prot. teach that it is lawfull in caſe of Adultery to haue diuorce, and the innocent party to marry another. Luther is a man of ſuch indifferency, that, (74) *He will neyther being in Poligamy, nor condemne it*: So that if one man haue 4. or 5. wyues at once, Luther will not reproue him for it.

(73) Inſtit. l. 4. c. 19. §. vlt. Bucer in c. 19. Matth. Brent. in Confeſſ. Wittemb. c. coniugio. Lutheri in c. 7. 1. ad Corinth. & l. de cauſis matrimonialibus.

SECT.

(74) In Geneſ. c. 16.

de coniugio. Chemnit. Exam. part. 2. p. 1249. Melanth. loc. Theol. Tit. de

SECT. II.

It is proued by Scriptures, that there are ſeauen Sacraments inſtituted by Chriſt our Sauiour.

ALl parts agree, that 3. things are neceſſary and ſufficient to the Effence of a Sacrament. Firſt, that it be an externall and ſenſible ſigne: ſecondly, that it haue a promiſe of grace annexed vnto it: and thirdly, a Commandement, or at leaſt an inſtitution of God, whereby it is cõmanded or ordained to be adminiſtred. Now, that none of theſe 3. things is wanting to any of the foreſayd 7. Sacraments (for defect whereof they ſhould be reiected for Sacraments, as they are by Proteſtãts) is proued firſt of Baptiſme, where the externall ſigne is, (1) *the lauer of water*; the Commandement, (2) *vnleſſe a man be borne agayne of water &c.* & elswhere, (3) *Go therefore teach you all nations, baptizing them in the name &c.* the promiſe of grace annexed is, (4) *he that beleeueth & is baptized, ſhalbe ſaued.*

(1) *Epheſ.5.26.*
(2) *Io.3.5.*
(3) *Mat.28.19.*
(4) *Mar.16.*

In the Euchariſt the externall ſigne is, (5) *he tooke bread and bleſſed, and brake &c.* the commandement, (6) *This do yee*; and (7) *vnles you eate the fleſh of the Sonne of man &c. you ſhall not haue lyfe in you*: the promiſe of grace, (8) *he that eateth this bread ſhall liue for euer.*

(5) *Mat.26.26.*
(6) *1.Cor.11.25.*
(7) *Io.6.53.*
(8) *Io.6.51.58.*

In Confirmation, the Externall ſigne is the Impoſition of hands, (9) *And when Simon Magus ſaw that by the impoſition of hands of the Apoſtles &c.* And agayne (10) *then they*, viz. Peter and Iohn) *put their hands vpon them* &c. the eff. & or promiſe of Grace is, *the holy Ghoſt was giuen*; the Commandemẽt from theſe Scriptures is deduced by neceſſary conſequence; for what man can inſtitute a Ceremony, vpon the application whereof the Grace of the holy Ghoſt ſhall follow? And ſhall we thinke, that the Apoſtles would ſo confidently and ſo ordinarily haue impoſed hands, to communicate therby the Grace of the holy Ghoſt, vnles God had commanded it vnto them? But the Apoſtles did confidently & ordinarily vſe impoſition of hands vpon the baptized, to the end

(9) *Act.8.18.*
(10) *Act.8.17.*

end that therby the holy Ghoſt might come vpon them, therfore it muſt needs follow, that herin either the Apoſtles did amiſſe (which were abſurd to ſay) or elſe, that they had Commandement from Chriſt to do what they did, ſince they knew right well, that no man (11) could inſtitute a Ceremony to which the Grace of the holy Ghoſt ſhould infallibly follow. (11) *Chem. Exam. part. 2. p. 13.*

Now, that this Ceremony of Impoſition of handes was ordinary and neceſſary, is proued by many places of holy Scriptures, as where it is ſaid of S. Peter and S. Iohn thus, (12) *They prayed for them, that they might receiue the holy Ghoſt, for as yet he was not come vpon any of them, but they were only baptized in the name of our Lord Ieſus: then they laid their handes vpon them, and they receiued the holy Ghoſt. And when Simon ſaw that by Impoſition of handes of the Apoſtles, the holy Ghoſt was giuen, he offered them money, ſaying: Giue vnto me alſo this power, that vpon whomſoeuer I lay handes he may receiue the holy Ghoſt.* Againe, (13) *when Paul had laid his handes vpon them the holy Ghoſt came vpon them, and they ſpake with tongues and prophecyed.* And in another place, (14) *Not laying againe the foundation of Pennance from dead workes, & of faith towardes God, of the Doctrine of Baptiſmes, and of Impoſition of handes, and of the Reſurrection of the dead, and of Eternall Iudgment.* Theſe places conuince, that by the impoſition of handes, the Holy Ghoſt, and his Grace were giuen by the Apoſtles. (12) *Act. 8. 15. 16. 17. 18. 19.* (13) *Act. 19. 6.* (14) *Heb. 6. 2.*

That Pennance is a Sacrament of the New Law truly and properly, it is proued out of theſe wordes, (15) *As my Father hath ſent me, I alſo do ſend you, when he had ſaid this, he breathed vpon them and he ſaid to them, Receiue ye the holy Ghoſte, whoſe ſinnes you ſhall forgiue they are forgiuen them, and whoſe you shall retayne, they are retayned.* Here we haue an Externall ryte or ſigne of the Actes of Contrition and Confeſſion, manifeſted by the Penitent, & the Iudiciall abſolution of the Prieſt, vttered in thoſe wordes, *Whoſe ſinnes you ſhall forgiue.* Secondly there is a Promiſe of Grace annexed vnto them in theſe wordes, *they are forgiuen them.* Thirdly we haue a Commandement in theſe wordes, *as my Father hath ſent me, I do alſo ſend you.* And vnto this Sacramẽt the Apoſtle alludeth ſaying, (16) God (15) Io. 20. 21. 23. (16) 2. Cor. 5. 18.

God hath giuen vnto vs the miniſtery of reconciliation &c.

That Extreme Vnction is alſo a Sacrament true and proper, is likewiſe proued from theſe wordes of S. Iames, (17) *Is any man ſicke amongſt you? let him bring in the Prieſtes of the Church, and let them pray ouer him, annoyling him with oyle in the name of our Lord, and the Prayer of faith ſhall ſaue the ſicke, & our Lord ſhall lift him vp, and if he be in ſinnes, they ſhalbe remitted him.* Here is firſt the ſigne or externall ryte, *Is any man ſicke amongſt you? let him bring in the Prieſtes of the Church, & let them pray ouer him, annoyling him with oyle in the name of our Lord.* Secondly here is a promiſe of grace, *And the prayer of faith ſhall ſaue the ſicke, and our Lord ſhall lift him vp, and if he be in ſinnes, they ſhalbe remitted him.* Thirdly the Commandement is euidently gathered out of thoſe generall wordes, *Is any man ſick? let him* &c. neither durſt the Apoſtle ſo abſolutly haue promiſed ſo great an effect, as remiſſion of ſinnes thereby, if he had not receiued the ſame of our Sauiour.

(17) Iac. 5. 14.

Whitaker not able to deny, but that S. Iames commaunded the ſicke to be annoyled, yet he numbreth this Argument amongſt Sophiſmes: (18) *Iames commandeth to annoynt the ſicke, therefore the ſicke are to be annoynted by vs.* As though Chriſtians were not bound to obey the Apoſtles, and their writings.

(18) *Ad rat. 3 Comp. p. 43.*

Molinæus anſwereth that thoſe wordes, (19) *If he be in ſinnes, they ſhalbe forgiuen him, do ſignify the ſame, That health ſhalbe reſtored vnto him, the ſinnes being forgiuen, for which God had afflicted him.* And he addeth, that (20) Chriſt, Mat. 9. doth teach vs, *That to ſay to the ſicke man, Thy ſinnes are forgiuen thee, and to ſay aryſe and walke, are things equiualent.* So that a Miniſter may ſay, *Aryſe and walke*, when he declareth remiſſion of ſinnes to the people. But what more abſurd then to confound remiſſion of ſinnes, with reſtoring to corporall health, as though theſe were but all one?

(19) Scuto. part. 2. p. 52.

(20) Ib. p. 52.

That Order is a Sacrament, it is proued firſt, becauſe here is the externall rite, to wit, *impoſition of handes*, (21) *with impoſition of the handes of Prieſthood*, or as it is elſwhere, (22) *by the impoſition of my handes.* Secondly here is a promiſe of Grace, (23) *Neglect not the grace that is in thee, which is giuen thee by Prophecy,*

(21) 1. Tim. 4. 14.
(22) 2. Tim. 1. 6.
(23) 1. Tim. 4. 14.

phecy, with impoſition of hands: and elſwhere, (24) *I admonish thee that thou reſuſcitate the Grace of God, which is in thee by the impoſition of my handes*. And thirdly here is the Inſtitution or Commandement, (25) *And he gaue ſome Apoſtles, and ſome Prophets, and other ſome Euangeliſtes, and other ſome Paſtors and Doctors* &c. But theſe three in the iudgment of our Aduerſaries are ſufficient to make a true and proper Sacrament of the New Law. Beſides how could the Apoſtle know, grace to be giuen to Timothy by the impoſition of handes, if he had not learned of God, by that ſigne Grace to be giuen?

(24) 2. Tim. 1. 6.

(25) Epheſ 4. 11. 12.

That Matrimony is alſo a Sacrament, is proued from thoſe wordes ſpoken of Matrimony, (26) *This is a great Sacrament*: and although Proteſtantes wrangle vpon the word μυστήριον in the Originall, yet it importeth as much as *Sacramentum* doth: & hence the externall ſigne is the viſible Contract betwixt the man and woman; for of that the Apoſtle ſpeaketh in the place cited, according to S. Hierome (27) & S. Chryſoſtome. Secondly we haue the Inſtitution, where it is ſaid, (28) *That that God hath ioyned together, let no man ſeparate*. Thirdly the promiſe of grace is gathered by neceſſary inference, for that Matrimony amongſt Chriſtians, which is Coniunction of man and woman, doth ſignify the Coniunction betwixt Chriſt and his Church, which is by grace and Charity, not only in regard of conformity of nature, but alſo in ſpirituall loue: but that cannot be ſignified vnles beſides the ciuill Contract, there were alſo a ſpirituall vnion of the mindes of the husband and wyfe. Therfore ſince Almighty God hath for that end inſtituted matrimony amongſt the faithfull, no doubt he therin conferreth his grace, whithout which the ſaid ſpirituall vnion cannot be had. And it might be confirmed out of other places of Scripture, (29) as where it is ſaid, *by generation of Children the ſhalbe ſaued, if they remayne in fayth and loue, and ſanctification with ſobrietie*. We fynd then in the Scriptures, that all thinges required to a true Sacrament, are alſo found in theſe ſeauen.

(26) Eph 5. 32.

(27) In hunc locum.

(28) Mat. 19. 5.

(29) 1. Tim. 2. 15. 2. Cor. 7. 14. 1. Theſſ. 4. 4.

SECT. III.

That the Ancient Fathers agreably with Catholickes beleiued, and taught that there were ſeauen Sacraments of the New Law.

CONcerning the number of the Sacramentes, it is to be obſerued, that the Fathers not foreknowing our preſent Controuerſy therof, did but ſpeake of them, as alſo of other pointes of Faith caſually, and as occaſion was miniſtred, and ſo accordingly S. Auſtine ſometymes mentioneth but one, ſometimes two, and ſometimes (1) more, therfore it is ſufficient if the Fathers in this ſort do make mention of all our Sacramentes. And yet in our behalfe the Teſtimony of Luther is very ſtrong, who writing of this point, obiecteth thus, (2) *But thou wilt ſay, what do you anſwere to Dionyſius, who numbreth vp ſix Sacramentes &c. I anſwere* (ſayth Luther) *that he alone of the old* (writers) *is to be had for ſeauen Sacramentes, although omitting Matrimony he only reciteth ſix.* And the like is confeſſed of him by D. Humfrey, (3) who affirmeth that S. Dioniſius in this reſpect *diſpleaſed Luther.* A great offence.

(1) *In pſ. 103. con. 1. & de Bap. cont. Don. l. 5. c. 20. & Ep. 119. c. 7.*

(2) *Tom. 2. Wittemb. de Captiuit. Babyl. f. 84.*

(3) *Ieſuit. part 2. p 519.*

Chemnitius (5) confeſſeth out of S. Cyprian, that he numbreth *fyue Sacraments*. And only euadeth that the *Sermon de ablutione pedum*, is not *S. Cyprians*, but forged vnder his name: but certaynly it was the writing of an Ancient Authour, who liued in the tyme of S. Cyprian; the booke *de operibus Cardinalibus Chriſti*, whereof this Sermon is a parcell, being dedicated to Cornelius B. of Rome, in S. Cyprians tyme, and to whome S. Cyprian himſelfe wrote, lib. 1. ep. 1. & 3. In ſo much as Eraſmus in his Annotations annexed to Cyprians workes, affirmeth it to be (5) *The works of ſome learned man of that age*; and Fulke acknowledgeth that, (6) *The Author was not in tyme much inferiour to Cyprian*.

(4) *Exam. part. 2. p. 7.*

(5) Vpon the folio 187.

(6) *Againſt Rhem. Teſt. in 2 Cor. 11. 20. ſect. 6.*

In like ſort where Tertullian caſually mentioneth diuers of our Sacraments, namely, Baptiſme, Extreme-Vnction, Confirmation, Orders, and the Euchariſt, ſaying moſt

moſt wittily (7) *The fleſh is waſhed, that the Soule may be cleanſed, the fleſh is anoyled that the Soule may be conſecrated, the fleſh is ſigned, that the Soule may be armed, the fleſh is couered with impoſition of hands, that the Soule may be enlightened with the Spirit, the fleſh eateth the body and bloud of Chriſt, that the ſoule may be fatned to God.* This ſaying is ſo diſpleaſing to Prot. that Mr. Parker in great choller demandeth, (8) *Who can brooke it?*

S. Auſtine alſo teaching, (9) *Vnleſſe the ſigne of the Croſſe be applyed, whether to the forhead of the beleeuers* (by Confirmation) *or to the water wherwith they are regenerated* (by Baptiſme) *or to the Oyle wherwith they are annointed* (by Extreme-Vnction) *or to the Sacrifice wherwith they are nourished* (by the holy Euchariſt) *none of theſe are rightly adminiſtred.* The Centuriſts (10) and D. Fulke reciting this his ſaying, do reproue him for the ſame. And yet the like ſaying to this of S. Auſtine, is vſed by (11) S. Chryſoſtome.

But more in particular concerning Chriſme or Confirmation, ſundry (12) Proteſtants reproue *Tertullian, Cyprian, Ambroſe, with Error of vſing the Croſſe in Confirming thoſe that were baptized.* M. Perkins ſayth, (13) *This Vnction pertayned to Baptiſme in the Weſt till aboue 300. yeares after Chriſt, for then was there another Confirmatory Vnction deuiſed by Melchiades, or as ſome ſay before him by Vrban the firſt*, who liued about Anno 223. S. Cyprian teaching, that, (14) *It is neceſſary that he who is baptized, receiuing Chriſme, ſhould alſo be annoynted*, the (15) Centuriſtes reproue him for the ſame, affirming further, that in the Ancient tymes, *Vnction and impoſition of hands followed Baptiſme, of which Tertulian &c. which cuſtome Cyprian erroneouſly maketh neceſſary.* (16) Chemnitius alſo reprehendeth S. Cyprian for ſaying of *Baptiſme and Confirmation, then they may be clerely ſanctifyed, and become the ſonnes of God, if they be borne of both Sacraments.* Mr. (17) Parker reproueth S. (18) Cyprian for terming the Oyle, *Signaculum Dominicum, our Lords Seale.* And (19) Chemnitius chargeth not only S. Cyprian, but alſo the Laodicean Councell, Melchiades, Cornelius, and Tertulian for the Sacrament of Confirmation: for which alſo Danæus reciteth and reiecteth ſundry of the Ancient Fathers, in theſe wordes, (20) *Ambroſe fauoureth ouer much his Siricius, and the Roman*

(7) *L. de reſur. Carnis. c. 8*
(8) *Ag. Symbol. part. 1. ſect. 11. p. 77. & part. 2. ſect. 10. p. 118.*
(9) *In Euang. Ioan. Tract. 118.*
(10) *Cent. 5. c. 6. Col. 657.* Fulke *ag. Rhem. Teſt in 1. Cor. 11. 14.*
(11) *In Matth. ho. 55.*
(12) Miniſters of Lincolne Dioceſſe in their Abridgment p. 42. And ſee Perk. *ag.* Symbol. p. 12 p. 133.
(13) *Vol. 2. p. 651.*
(14) *L. 1. ep. 11.*
(15) *Cen. 3. col. 113.*
(16) *Exam. part. 2. p. 58.*
(17) *Againſt Symbol. p. 133.*
(18) *Ep. ad Iubaianum.*
(19) *Exam. part 2. p. 58. 64. 65.*
(20) *Reſp. ad ſum. 2. Bell. p. 431. 432.*

Roman Bishops, who brought forth that Confirmation. Therefore what &c. Ambroſe writes, is to be attributed to his Error, or favour towards the Pope of Rome, not to the truth: Hieromes ſentence againſt the Luciferians corrupteth the place of the 8. Chapter of the Acts: Auſtine was overwhelmed with the Error of the time wherein he lived. So generall was this Doctrine in S. Auſtines age. And others do report, that M. (21) *Wainquiſt ſhewed at large the Antiquity of Confirmation, as being uſed in the Church euen ſince the Apoſtles tymes.* And ſundry Puritanes charge (22) *Tertullian, Cyprian, Ambroſe, with Errour of uſing the Croſſe, in confirming thoſe that were baptized.*

(21) Confer. at Hampt. Court p. 10. 10. Downhams Def. l. 4. p. 23.

(22) Abridgment. p. 410.

Concerning holy Orders, to omit that already it is confeſſed heere, that S. Cyprian, Tertullian, and S. Denis, did teach them to be truly a Sacrament, numbring them amongſt the reſt: the very *Minores Ordines*, inferiour Orders of Deacons, Subdeacons, Readers, Exorciſtes, Acolytes, are ſo plainly taught in the Primitiue Church, that D. Field *maketh* (23) *no queſtion, but thoſe Minor Orders were very ancient*; alledging in proofe thereof, the teſtimonies of Cyprian, Cornelius and Ignatius; and for the ſame the (24) Centuriſtes alledge the Fathers of the fourth Age. But (25) Luther confeſſeth, that *S. Denis* (S. Pauls Scholler) *affirmeth that there are in the Church, Biſhops, Deacons, Subdeacons, Lectours, Exorciſtes &c.*

(23) Of the Church l. 5. p. 121. Oſiand. Cent. 1. p 131.

(24) *Cent.* 4. Col. 873. 874.

(25) *Tom. 6. Wittemb. f.* 53.

That Matrimony is a Sacrament, S. Auſtine teacheth, that, (26) *A certayne Sacrament of Marriage is commended to the faythfull that are maryed, whereupon the Apoſtle ſayth, Husbands loue your wyues, as Chriſt loued the Church.* This Doctrine is ſo cleer in S. Auſtine and others Fathers, that Fulke granteth, that, (27) *Auſtine and ſome other of the Ancient Fathers take it, that matrimony is a great Myſtery of the Coniunction of Chriſt, and his Church.* In regard of which inſeparable Coniunction, Melanchton acknowledgeth; that, (28) *The Milevitane Councell, at which Auſtine was preſent &c. decreed concerning diuorce, that the innocent party ſhould not marry againe.* Whereof alſo ſay the Centuriſtes, (29) *The opinion of Auſtine is, that it is not lawfull for the Innocent party to marry againe*: for which alſo he is reprehended by (30) Chemnitius.

(26) *De nupt. & concup. l. 1, c. 10.*

(27) *In Rhem. Teſt. in Epb. 5. 32. ſect. 5.*

(28) *In Ep. ad Rom. c. 14. p. 367.*

(29) *Cent. 5. c. 4. Col. 519. & c. 10. Col. 1233.*

(30) *Exam. part. 2. p. 263.*

Laſtly,

Laſtly, as touching Extreme Vnction, S. Auſtine ſpeaking of the ſicke, ſayth, (31) *Let him aske of the Church holy Oyle, wherewith his body may be annoynted, according to the Apoſtle, Iames 5.* And againe, (32) *Let him annoynt his body, that it may be fulfilled in him, which is written, Is any man ſicke? let him bring in the Prieſts, & let two pray over him annointing him with Oyle.* S. Innocentius ſpeaking of the ſame wordes of S. Iames ſayth, (33) *Without doubt it is to be vnderſtood of the faythfull being ſicke, who may be annoynted with the holy Oyle of Chriſme.* Affirming further that, *Not only Prieſtes in their ſickneſes, but alſo lay perſons in theirs, may haue the benefit and vſe thereof.* This is ſo cleere in Innocētius, that Bale ſayth (34) *Of the annoyling of the ſicke, Innocentius hath made a Sacrament.* Agreably to which writeth Szegedine, *that* (35) *Innocentius the firſt, and Felix the fourth haue made a Sacrament of the annoyling of the ſicke.* But to cleere theſe good Popes of all Innouation, the Epiſtle of S. Iames is for this very cauſe reiected by Luther in theſe words, (46) *But I ſay, if in any place it be foolishly written, in this eſpecially &c. But of it were the Epiſtle of Iames the Apoſtle, I would ſay, that it were not lawfull for an Apoſtle by his owne authority to inſtitute a Sacrament &c. for this belongeth to Chriſt alone.* As though an Apoſtle would aſſume to himſelfe the inſtitution of a Sacrament, or any other authority that were not lawfull. S. Chriſoſtome ſayth of the effect of this Sacrament, (37) *they* (ſpeaking of Prieſts) *do not only remit ſinnes in Baptiſme, but afterwards alſo according to the ſaying of S. Iames, If any man be ſicke, let him bring in the Prieſts &c.* And ſuch is the confeſſed ancient vſe of Extreme Vnction in the Church, that Whitaker anſwering to the Ancient Fathers obiected teſtimonies in behalfe thereof, ſayth, (38) *I acknowledge the ſuperſtitious cuſtome of this Vnction to haue continued longer in the Church then was meet.* So confeſſedly were all the ſeauen Sacraments taught, and beleeued by the Ancient Fathers.

(31) Tom. 9. de Reſtitudine Cath. Converſationis poſt mortem.
(32) Ser. de temp. 115. & de viſit. infir. l. 2. c. 4 Orig. hom. 2. in Leuit. Proſper. de Prædict. l. 2. c. 19.
(33) Ep. ad Eugubin.
(34) Pageant of Popes. fol. 28.
(35) Speculum. Pontif. p. 33.
(36) Tom. 2. Witton. de Captiu. Babyl. fol. 86.
(37) L. 3. de Sacerd.
(38) Cont. Durarum. l. 3. p. 650.

SECT.

SECT. IV.

Protestant writers do teach, and confesse the number of seauen Sacraments agreably with Catholikes.

CONcerning Confirmation the English *Communion Booke* turned into Latin, & printed (1) at London by Thomas Vautrollerius *cum Priuilegio* saith, *Confirmatio illis adhibetur &c. Confirmation is exhibited vnto them that are baptized, that by Imposition of hands & prayer they may receiue strength and defence against the inuasion of sinne, the world, and the Diuell.* This is so cleere, that the Puritanes with much dislike say, (2) *The Communion booke giueth to Confirmation the definition of a Sacrament.* In like manner doth Mr. Hooker acknowledge and affirme, *not only the visible signe of* (3) *laying on of hands hitherto alwayes continued in Confirmation, but also the guift or grace of the holy Ghost, which armeth vs against Temptation and sin.* And aswell (5) he as other Prot. writers do affirme and proue the same from Scriptures. D. Couell saith, (6) *In Baptisme we are regenerated to lyfe, but in Confirmation we are strengthened to battaile.*

As touching Orders, Melancthon defendeth it to be a Sacrament properly, saying, (7) *Maximè autẽ placet &c. I like very well to haue Orders (as they call it) numbred among the Sacraments.* And in other his Common places (8) of later Edition, he not only calleth it a *Sacrament*, but affirmeth further, *that it is commanded by the Ghospell, and hath a promise annexed.* In like manner doth (9) Zwinglius accompt it for a Sacrament, as also doth M. Hooker, in acknowledging therin not only the visible signe of (10) hand imposing, but also the (11) *ἀόρατον*, and guift (12) of the spirit. Bilson also acknowledgeth in like sort, *the grace* (13) *of the holy Ghost giuen by hands imposing*: and alleadgeth M. Caluin (14) *confessing that it is a kind of Sacrament*, and saying therof, (15) *Libenter eo loco habeo: I willingly accept it for a Sacrament. for there is a Ceremony of hand-imposing a sure signe of spiritu all Grace; and that I put it not the third in number of Sacramentes, was* (sayth he) *because it is not ordinary*

(1) *Anno Domini* 1574.
(2) Abridgment. p. 76.
(3) Eccl. Pol. l. 5. sect. 66. p. 169.
(4) Ib. p. 170. 173.
(5) Ib. pa. 170. See Whiteg. defence of the answere to the Admonition. Tract. 14 p. 581. 583. & 726. 727.
(6) Ag. the Plea of Innoc. p. 192.
(7) Loc. com. Edit. 1536.
(8) Edit. 1558. 1558.
(9) L. de vera & falsa relig.
(10) Eccl. Pol. l. 5. sect. 77. p. 210.
(11) Ibidem.
(12) Ibidem prope init.
(13) Perp. Gouern. p 109.
(14) Ib post med.
(15) Caluin. cited Ibid. vide Calu. Instit. l 4. c. 19. sect. 28 31. 32. & c. 14. f. 20.

ordinary, nor common to all the faithfull, but a speciall rite for a certaine function. And hence it is, that in his treatise against (16) the Tridentine Councell, he reiected from the number of the 7. Sacramentes, only the other foure. (17) Clapham alleating Austine, Caluin, Bucer, Melancthon, and others, affirmeth it to be a *Sacrament.*

As concerning *Extreme Vnction*, the Deuines in their Conference at Lipsia, whereat were present (as M. Sleydan (18) witnesseth) Melancthon, and other learned men of Lipsia and Wittemberge, acknowledge *Extreme Vnction to be a Sacrament:* In so much as Illyricus doth therfore reproue them, saying, (19) *They haue not obscurely restored as Sacramentes, Confirmation, Order, and Extreme Vnction.* Caluin speaking of Extreme Vnction sayth, (20) *I do truly confesse, that it was vsed for a Sacrament, by the Disciples of Christ, neither do I assent vnto them, who thinke it was a medicine.*

Againe, (21) *As we Confesse that Vnction was a Sacrament, which the Apostles ministred for the curing of the sicke, so we deny that it belongeth to vs:* Here Caluin confesseth it to be a Sacrament, and that the Apostles in their tyme did minister it, and yet it must not belong to vs Christians, which is most ridiculous.

As concerning the Sacrament of *Absolution* and *Penitance*, Luther in a Tract. of his published a litle before his death sayth, (22) *We willingly acknowledge Pennance with the power of the absoluing keyes to be a Sacrament, for it hath a Promise, and saith of Remission of sinnes from Christ.* Also the Apology of the Confession of Augusta saith, (23) *It is easy to iudge which be properly Sacramentes, therfore Baptisme, the supper of our Lord, and Absolution are truly Sacramentes, for these rites haue the Commandement of God, and promise of Grace:* and of the same iudgment, expressed also in the very same wordes, is their learned Deuine (24) Iohn Spangeberge. Melancthon also sayth, (25) *The Sacrament of Pennance is profitably numbred amongst the Sacramentes.* And againe, (26) *It is easy to iudge which be Sacramentes* (namely sayth he) *Baptisme, the supper of our Lord, and Absolution.* And the same accompt is made aswell by Andreas (27) Athamerus, as also by (28) Erasmus Sarterius. As concerning Matrimony, Zwinglius seemeth (29) to acknow-

(16) *In Antidoto Concil. Trid. Sess. 7. Can. 1.*
(17) *Chron. lo. c. 8.*
(18) *Histor. l 10.*
(19) *L. de veris & falsis Adiaphoris.*
(20) *Comment. in loc. 5. 14. & in Antidot. Conc. Trid. ad Can. 1. de Sacram. in genere.*
(21) *De vera Eccles. reform p. 330.*
(22) *Iustr. cont. Louan. Assert 33.*
(23) *Vide Apol. Confess. August. Art. 13. de numero & vsu Sacram. f. 161.*
(24) *Margarita Theol. de Sacram. p. 116 117.*
(25) *Loc. com. Edit. 1536. de Sacram. in genere.*
(26) *Ib. de Pœnit.*
(27) *In Conc.*

ledge it for a Sacrament: Yet he is not willing that the name Sacrament be aſcribed vnto it, becauſe he thinketh the word Marriage, or Wedlocke, is much more excellent, then the word Sacrament. So this carnall Hereticke.

Melanchon acknowledgeth, that, Matrimony (30) is a ſigne of a ſacred thing, & hath a Commandement from God, and Promiſe of Grace annexed vnto it: only one thing (ſayth he) is wanting vnto it, that it was before Chriſt. But this in his opinion can be no impediment, who teacheth that the Baptiſme of S. Iohn Baptiſt was moſt truly a Sacrament, and the ſame with ours, and yet it was before Chriſt: wherfore as he thinketh Baptiſme to be a Sacrament, becaule it was receiued & confirmed by Chriſt, by the ſame reaſon he may thinke of Marriage.

And to conclude, it is manifeſt that Iohn Huſſe (31) & the Waldenſes (32) did acknowledge with vs, *all the 7. Sacraments*. And Benedict Morgenſterne (33) reproueth the Waldenſes, for that, ſayth he, *Cum Papiſtis ſeptem Sacramenta numerant, with the Papiſtes they number 7. Sacraments*, Wiccliffe (34) alſo beliued *7. Sacramentes*. And ſo alſo, as Illyricus (35) witneſſeth, *did the Diuines aſſembled at the Conference of Lipſia*, as alſo at *the Conference of Ratisbone* (36), wherat were preſent Melanchon and Bucer, and alſo, as M. Beza (37) affirmeth, Iohn Caluin; there thoſe Deuines acknowledged *7. Sacraments*. In ſo much that Bucer himſelfe ſaid therof, (38) *Proteſtantes non grauatim admiſerunt ſeptem Sacramenta, the Proteſtantes willingly admitted 7. Sacramentes*. And Luther himſelfe confeſſeth that, (39) *Of all Eccleſiaſticall* (men) *ſt is the ſame Baptiſme, the ſame Church, the ſame Confirmation, the ſame word of God, the ſame Prieſthood, the ſame of Penuance, Vnction, Marriage, and all Sacramentes*. Rokizana confidently writeth thus, (40) *I conſtantly ſay, that there are ſeauen Sacraments of the New Law, Baptiſme, Confirmation, Euchariſt, Pennance, Extreme Vnction, Order, Matrimony*. Perzibrane maketh this Confeſſion of his faith in this point, (41) *I Confeſſe, that the 7. Sacramentes of the holy Church deliuered by God the Author, and inſtituted by the Authority of his Apoſtles, are by all to be faithfully and inuiolably beliued, kept, and reuerenced; which are ſacred Baptiſme, Confirmation, Orda*

loc. Script. pugn. n. 291. f. 221. & n. 295. f. 229.
(28) Loc. com. Tom. 2. de poteſt. Eccleſiæ f. 305.
(29) L. de vera & falſ. relig. c. de Matrimonio.
(30) In locis vltimo editis Anno 38.
(31) Vide Conc. Conſtant. Seſſ. 15. Act. 8. & Act. Mon. p. 226. Huſſ. ad c. 5. Ep. Ioc.
(32) L. Lutheri ad Waldenſes.
(33) Tract. de Eccleſia p. 250. 223.
(34) Wiccl. in poſtilla ſuper. 15. cap. Marci. & ſuper. 2. Cor. 2.
(35) In adhort. ad Conſtan. in agnita Chriſti relig. &c.
(36) 1541.
(37) In vita Caluini.
(38) In Actis Colloq. Ratisb.

Order &c. But to conclude, you ſee the whole number of our Sacraments to be taught and beleiued by Huſſites, Waldenſians, Wiccliffiſtes, and Lutherans, and moſt of them alſo by the Caluiniſtes.

Only I muſt wiſh the Chriſtian Reader to aduertiſe, that ſeeing Prot. (42) do make a chiefe note of the true Church, to be the conſent in the Doctrine of the Sacraments, yet themſelues could neuer with Common conſent agree of the very number of them; ſome of them as you haue heard, teaching 2. others 3. others 4. and diuers 7. From which diſagreement in a matter of ſuch waight, we may well hope that their Hereſies cannot long continue, ſeeing *euery kingdome deuided within it ſelfe, shalbe deſtroyed.* In ſo much that Luther himſelfe obſerueth, that, (43) *No heretickes are ouercome by force of crafte, but by mutuall diſſenſion: neither doth Chriſt fight otherwiſe with them, then by ſending amongſt them the ſpirit of giddines and diſſenſion, as among the Sichimites, Iud. 9. and as among the builders of the Tower of Babel, Gen. 11. and in the New Law amongſt Arrians, Donatiſtes, and Pelagians:* to whom I may iuſtly ioyne Lutherans, Zwinglians, Caluiniſtes, Puritanes, and all ſorts of Proteſtantes.

(39) *De Poteſtate Papæ.*
(40) *De Sacramentis in genere.*
(41) *Cap. 8.*
(42) *Luth. l. de notis Eccl. & Confeſſ. Auguſt. & Apol. Art. 7.*
(43) *In pſ. 5.* See alſo S. *Hilar. l. 7. de Trinit.*

SECT. V.

Containing certaine Reaſons, or Congruences eſtablishing the number of ſeauen Sacramentes.

FOr ſo much as by the Confeſſion of M. Hooker, (44) *There haue growne in the doctrine concerning Sacramentes, many difficulties for want of diſtinct explication, what kind, or degree of grace doth belong vnto ech Sacrament*, I will therfore explaine the ſame vnder Example and reſemblance of our Corporall life. In Baptiſme we are (45) borne againe, and as (46) Infants new borne, it being to vs therfore the beginning, or lauer of our ſpirituall (47) regeneration: *Originall* (48) *ſinne* (as Bilſon accoucheth) *being not remitted but in Baptiſme.*

(44) *Eccl. Pol. l. 5. ſect. 57. p. 128.*
(45) Io. 3. 5.
(46) 1. Pet. 2. 2.
(47) Tit. 3. 5.
(48) True difference part. 4. p. 308.

Secondly, being heerby thus entred into the Infancy

of our ſpirituall life, our B. Sauiour did inſtitute Confirmation, for our ſpirituall growth, ſtrength (49) and defence: which power, or ſtrengthening, as our Sauiour did (50) promiſe, ſo did he alſo performe the ſame; inſtituting to this end, the viſible ſigne of impoſition (51) of handes, and the giuing of the holy Ghoſt by the ſame, which guift though it was in the Apoſtles tymes accompanied with other miraculous guiftes, as of languages &c. yet as M. Hooker (52) confeſſeth, and anſwereth hereto, the ſaid miraculous guift, was not the principall effect of the then giuing of the holy Ghoſt, but only an accident therto, as being a miraculous externall teſtimony, of the inward grace therby conferred, neceſſary for the increaſe of faith in thoſe tymes, as in like manner the vnworthy receiuing (53) of the Sacrament, the preaching (54) of the word, were accompanied with like externall teſtimony of miracles: and ſo alſo were offenders puniſhed and excommunicated, accompanied with viſible puniſhment, as appeareth by example of Ananias (55) and Saphira, the inceſtuous (56) Corinthian, and Elimas (57) the Magitian: in ſo much as S. Auſtine ſpeaking of the Confirming of young Children, ſayth, (58) *Is there any of ſo peruerſe a hart, as to deny theſe Children, on whom we now impoſe hands, to haue receiued the holy Ghoſt, becauſe they ſpeake not with tongues?* affirming elſwhere, that the miraculous guift of tongues, accompanied the other guift of the holy Ghoſt, (59) *for the enlarging of the Churches firſt beginning.*

(49) The Communion Booke of Anno 1604. Hook. Eccl. Pol. l. 5. ſect. 66.
(50) *Luc* 24. 49. *Act.* 1 8.
(51) *Act.* 8. 17. 18.
(52) *Eccl. Pol. l.* 5 *ſect.* 66. *p.* 170.
(51) 1. *Cor.* 11. 30.
(54) *Mar.* 16. 17. 18.
(55) *Act.* 5. 5. 10. 11.
(56) 1. *Cor.* 5. 4. 5.
(57) *Act.* 13. 6. 11.
(58) *Aug. in Ep. Ioan. tract* 6.
(59) Ibid.

Thirdly, the Euchariſt is our ſpirituall nouriſhment & food, wherby is preſerued our ſpirituall life and ſtrength, before receiued in Baptiſme: and ſo M. Hooker confeſſeth ſaying, (60) *The grace which we haue by the holy Euchariſt, doth not beginne* (as Baptiſme doth) *but continue life*: with whom agreeth Peter Martyr ſaying, (61) *In Baptiſme Chriſt is giuen as a Regenerator, but in the Euchariſt he is diſtributed vnto vs as meat & nouriſhment.*

(60) Eccl. Pol. l. 5 ſect. 67 p. 171.
(61) *Loc. com. Engl. part.* 4. *p.* 253.

Fourthly, being new borne, growne, and fed, as aforeſaid, we are as Souldiars ſtill ſubiect to a ſpirituall (62) conflict with ſinne, wherwith if we be wounded, we are not, as before, to be new borne againe, as in Baptiſme, but to be cured:

(62) 1. Pet. 2. 11. Heb. 10. 32. Epheſ. 6. 11. 12.

cured: in remedy therfore herof, God had ordained the Sacrament of Pennance, giuing our ſpirituall Phiſitians power to cure our hartes: the viſible and externall rite wherof, is the iudiciall Abſolution implied in theſe words, (63) *Whoſe ſinnes you ſhall forgiue*, and the inuiſible grace annexed therto, which is remiſſion of ſinnes, in theſe other words, (64) *They are forgiuen them.* (63) Io. 20. 23. (64) Ibid.

Fifthly, for our more ſecure departure out of this world, God hath inſtituted the Sacrament of Extreme Vnction, to preſerue vs againſt all ſpirituall and ſickly diſpoſitions and relickes of ſinne: the viſible ſigne wherof is ſignifyed in theſe wordes, (65) *Is any man ſicke? let him bring in the Preſbyters &c. and let them pray ouer him, anoyling him with oyle*; and the inuiſible grace in theſe other wordes, (66) *And the Lord ſhall lift him vp, and if he bein ſinnes, they ſhalbe forgiuen him*. And whereas the Proteſtants (67) would vnderſtand this, not of any Sacrament, but only of the miraculous cure of thoſe who were annointed (68) with oyle and healed; this colluſion will not ſerue the turne, for this firſt miraculous curing by oyle mentioned in S. Marke, was vſed only as a preparatiue to the other mentioned by S. Iames, which did differ from the ſaid firſt in many reſpects. As firſt we fynd our B. Sauiour in Cure of the diſeaſed, vſed ſometimes (69) *Clay and ſpitle*, and the Apoſtles, oyle &c. but that he generally appointed any of them for a generall medicine we fynd not. Againe men are no where commanded to ſeeke for their cure by miracle, but in this place of Iames is a commandement ſignified; alſo the guift of Miraculous cure was not common (70) to all Prieſtes or Elders, but to ſome only; whereas here the Commandement is indefinite, referred indifferently to them all. (65) Iac. 5. 14. (66) Ibid. (67) Fulk. 2g. Rhem. Teſt. fol. 413. Wilet Sy nop. p. 549. (68) Mar. 6. 13. (69) Mar. 7. 31. 33. (70) 1. Cor. 12. 9 10. 27. 28.

Fourthly, S. Iames ſpeaketh not of curing the party, but of eaſing, or liſting him vp in ſoule. And if this place of S. Iames had concerned a miraculous cure, which the ſicke perſon had bene commanded to ſeeke for, and promiſed to obtayne (as the thing here intended is commanded to be ſought for, and promiſed to be giuen.) who then would in thoſe tymes haue dyed, when he might haue obtained his cure by miracle, and bene commanded ſo to do? And laſtly to

omit many other differences, this conferreth Remiſſion of ſinnes, which a miraculous cure did not. And hereunto may be added, that the Catholicke Church throughout the world, obſerueth this practiſe of Extreme Vnction, not as inuented by men, but affirmed by Fathers and Proteſtants, and vſed in all ages without any firſt Inſtitution therof noted, other then that which was in the Apoſtles time. A truth ſo certaine, that Caluin himſelfe ſayth, (71) *I do truly confeſſe that it was vſed for a Sacrament by the Diſciples of Chriſt, neither do I aſſent vnto them who thinke it was a medicine.*

(71) *Comment. in Iac. 5 17. & in Antid. Couc. Trid. ad Can. 1. de Sacram. in genere.*

Now concerning *Order* and *Matrimony*, as in our Corporall life and Common wealth, there are required as well parents, who by propagation may continue and increaſe the ſame, as alſo Magiſtrates, to order and gouerne it: So in our ſpirituall common wealth, Matrimony is eſtabliſhed anſwerable to the firſt, and the Sacrament of Orders for the other: and that as the viſible contract betwene man and wyfe, is not only a ciuill and naturall contract, but alſo an externall Symbole of a ſacred thing, namely of the Eſpouſall of Chriſt with his Church, (in reſpect wherof he is called the bridegroome, and ſhe the ſpouſe) for example; And, (72) *I will eſpouſe thee to me for euer*; And, *I will eſpouſe thee vnto me in Iuſtice and Iudgment, and in mercy, and in Commiſerations. and I will eſpouſe thee to me in faith.* And elſwhere, (73) *I haue eſpouſed you to one man, to preſent you a chaſt Virgin to Chriſt.* And yet in a third place, (74) *Let vs reioyce and exult, and giue glory to him, becauſe the Mariage of the Lambe is come, & his wyfe hath prepared herſelfe.* And laſtly, (75) *Come* (ſayth one of the 7. Angels) *and I will ſhow thee the Bryde, the wyfe of the Lambe.* By all which places it appeareth, that marriage conferreth grace, that the parties maried (76) *may know to poſſeſſe their veſſell in ſanctification &c.* and being accordingly (77) called *a great Sacrament*, or miſtery: So alſo concerning the Sacrament of Orders, there is mentioned the inuiſible grace, which is giuen by, (78) & with the externall ryte of Impoſition of hands.

(72) *Oſe. 2. 19. 20.*

(73) *2. Cor. 11. 2.*

(74) *Apoc. 19. 7.*

(75) *Apoc. 21. 9.*

(76) *1. Theſ. 4. 3. 4.*

(77) *Epheſ. 5. 32.*

(78) *2. Tim. 1. 6. 1. Tim. 4. 14.*

The ſecond reaſon or congruence, to proue the forſayd number of 7. Sacraments, is drawne from the number of our ſinnes and wounds: for Baptiſme is againſt Originall ſinne,

Pen-

Pennance agaynſt actuall, Extreme Vnction againſt the remainders of ſinne, Confirmation agaynſt infirmity, Euchariſt againſt malice, Matrimony againſt Concupiſcence, Order agaynſt ignorance.

The third Congruence ariſeth from the number of vertues. Baptiſme anſwereth to faith, Confirmation to Hope, Euchariſt to Charity, Pennance to Iuſtice, Vnction to Fortitude, Order to Prudence, Matrimony to Temperance.

The fourth may be taken from the honour of the ſeauenth Number vſed in Expiations by Sacrifice, as we may ſee in (79) ſeuerall places of Scripture, where 7. beaſtes are offered, or 7. dayes, or 7. tymes ſprinkled with bloud &c.

(79) *Exod. 29. Leuit. 4. & 8. 13. 14. 15. 16. 23 num. 19. Deut. 15. 2. Paral. 29. Iob. vlt. 4. Reg. 5. S. Th. in 4. Diſt. 2. q. 1. 3. part. q. 65. art. 2. & cont. Gent. l. 4. c. 58.*

Now whereas Chemnitius in anſwere to theſe our Cõgruences affirmeth, that, (80) *Theſe are the Demonſtrations, theſe the foundations, wherewith the number of 7. Sacraments was brought into the Church, and receyued by Scholaſticall writers:* And that in the Old Law there were vertues and ſinnes, and a ſpirituall and corporall lyfe, and therefore by the lyke reaſon they ſhould haue 7. Sacraments. As alſo, that in the Scriptures there are ſeuerall numbers renowned and ſacred, as 3. 12. &c. And therefore, that hence we may aſwell proue that there are 3. 12. or more Sacraments. But all this is but weake, for no Deuine affirmeth, theſe to be demonſtrations or foundations, but only ſuppoſing fayth to be congruences. Schoolmen endeauour to ſhew, that thoſe things which we belieue, are not repugnant, but conformable to reaſon. In like ſort, The Old Sacraments were not ordained to perfect mã in a ſpirituall lyfe, nor for remedy of ſinne, Circumciſion excepted, but only to repreſent Chriſtian Myſteries, and certaine other ends: Wheras our Sacraments are inſtituted in remedy of ſinne, and to iuſtify and perfect man in ſpirituall life, and therfore theſe congruences may fitly be applyed to our Sacraments, not to the Old. So alſo the Congruence from Numbers, is not taken from all numbers whatſoeuer, but from ſuch as ſignify Expiation or Satisfaction fot ſinne. Now, the number of 7. in Expiations, is ſo frequent in Scriptures, as that the whole Scripture may be thought

(80) *Exam. part. 2. p. 16. 17. 18.*

to

to haue proclaymed and foretould, that a tyme there should be, wherein 7. most excellent, and efficacious remedies of sinne should be giuen by God, for the Expiation, & Purgation of sinne.

SECT. VI.

Containing certaine Obiections, had from Scriptures against the number of 7. Sacraments; with Answers thereto

THE first Oiection is, The Scripture do no where name 7. Sacraments, therefore there are not seauen. Answ. Neyther do the Scriptures name or call Baptisme & the Eucharist, Sacraments, which yet are not excluded from being Sacraments.

Secondly, if want of naming them in Scripture, were sufficient to abrogate and disallow them, by the same reason might, *Trinity, and Vnity*, be reiected, for that these names also are no where to be found in Scripture. If reply be made, that for *Trinity, and Vnity*, and for Baptisme, and the Eucharist, the substance of the things themselues are expressed in Scripture, therefore these are to be admitted; I grant the whole, and consequenly likewise inferre vpon the same ground, that as for the things required to make the other 5. Sacraments, that is, a Visible signe, and Inuisible grace, and a Commandement, these are sufficiently found in Scriptures, as hath beene already proued by Scriptures. In like sort though the Scriptures do not in expresse wordes say, there are 7. Sacraments, yet neither do they say how many bookes there are of Canonicall Scriptures, and yet they say in generall, there are diuine Scriptures: the certayne number whereof is only knowne by the Tradition of the Church, and Generall Councels, not by the Scriptures themselues. And if they questiō must be *de nomine*, of *Names*, then who knoweth not, that the name Saccrament is ascribed often in the Scriptures to sundry things, which by the consent of all sydes are not properly Sacraments. So the Intention of calling the Gentiles

tiles to the faith, is called (1) *The Sacrament of Gods will*: the Incarnation of the ſonne of God, is called (2) *a great Sacrament of piety*: & the ſigne written in the forhead of the woman repreſenting Babylon, is called, (3) *The Sacrament of the woman*. So many wayes is this Obiection anſwered.

The ſecond Obiection vrged by (4) Chemnitius, is, that out of Chriſtes ſyde yſſued (5) only *bloud & water*, wherby is ſignifyed, that there are but two Sacraments, the Euchariſt and Baptiſme. I anſwere, though thereby were only (6) ſignifyed theſe two, as being moſt principall, yet it doth not follow, that there are no more: So alſo S. Paul only reckoneth (7) Baptiſme, and the Impoſition of hands, viz. Cõfirmation. Secondly, (8) others vnderſtand by *bloud and water, Martyrdome and Baptiſme*, and ſome, which ſeemeth alſo moſt litterall, (9) vnderſtand by *bloud, the price of our Redemption*, and by *water, Baptiſme*.

Chemnitius alſo obiecteth that the Angell calleth (10) the Beaſt which had 7. heads, *a Sacrament*, thereby ſignifying the number of 7. Sacraments, to belong to Antichriſt. Anſw. If the ſeauen heads of the beaſt be the 7. Sacraments, then Baptiſme and the Euchariſt which are two of them, are two heads of the Beaſt, which any Chriſtian might bluſh to affirme. Secondly, S. Iohn doth not call the 7. heads 7. Sacraments, but one Sacrament or Myſtery: which agreeth better to Luther, who affirmed (11) ſometymes, that there was but one Sacrament. Thirdly, S. Iohn expoundeth *thoſe 7. heads, to be 7. Kings, ſaying*, (12) *The ſeauen heads, are ſeauen hilles, vpon which the woman ſitteth, & they are 7. Kings*. So weake & impertinent are theſe Obiections from Scripture.

(1) *Eph.1.9.*
(2) *1. Tim.3. 16.*
(3) *Apoc. 17. 7.*
(4) *Exam. part.2.*
(5) *Io.19.34.*
(6) *Chryſoſt, Cyril. & Theophilact. in hunc locum: Damaſc. l.4.de fide. c. 10. Aug. l.2. de Symbolo. c. 6. & Tract. 9.in Ioan.*
(7) *Hebr.6. 2.*
(8) *Cyr. Catech.3. Hier. Ep.81. ad Oceanum.*
(9) *Ambr. l. 10. in Luc. c. 105. Leo Ep. 4. Aug. & Beda in c.19. Ioan.*
(10) *Apoc. 17.3.*
(11) *De Capt. Babyl.*
(12) *Apoc. 17.9.*

CHAP. XX.

The true ſtate of the Queſtion, concerning the neceſſity of Baptiſme.

Whether the Sacrament of Baptiſme, or the deſire thereof, be not abſolutly neceſſary to Saluation, not only becauſe it is commanded by Chriſt, but becauſe it is a meanes neceſſary therto: ſo that children dying without Baptiſme, cannot be ſaued.

SECT. I.

Catholike Doctrine.

AMONGST the greateſt bleſſings which the Church inioyeth through the merits of Chriſt, one of the firſt & chiefeſt is the holy Sacrament of Baptiſme: cõcerning which, the Catholike Church teacheth, that, (1) *The Iuſtification of the wicked &c. after the preaching of the Ghoſpell cannot be made without the laner of Regeneration, or the deſire thereof.* And it further decreeth, that, (2) *If any ſhall ſay, that the Baptiſme of Iohn, had the ſame force with the Baptiſme of Chriſt &c.* (3) *or that true and naturall water is not of the Neceſſity of Baptiſme &c.* or (4) *that Baptiſme is free, that is, not neceſſary to Saluation, &c.*

(1) Concil. Trident. Seſſ. 6. Cap. 4.
(2) Conc. Trid. Seſſ. 7. c. 1.
(3) Can. 2.
(4) Can. 5.

&c. (5) Or, *that Children baptized, becauſe they haue not actuall fayth, are not to be accompted amongſt the faythfull, and therefore to be rebaptized when they ſhall come to the yeares of diſcretion &c. let him be accurſed.*

(5) Con. 15.

In the firſt Councell of Nice it is decreed, that, (6) *He that is baptized deſcendeth guilty of ſinnes, and ſubiecth to the ſeruitude of Corruption; and aſcendeth freed from his ſeruitude & ſinne, made the Sonne of God, and the heyre of his grace, coheyre alſo of Chriſt, hauing put vpon him Chriſt himſelfe, as it is written,* (7) *Whoſoeuer you are that are baptized in Chriſt, you haue put on Chriſt.* In the Councell of Conſtantinople it is ſayd in the Creed, (8) *I beleeue one Baptiſme to remiſſion of ſinnes.* In the ſecond Mileuitane Councell it is detyned, that, (9) *Whoſoeuer denyeth Children newly borne to be baptized, or ſay &c. that they contract nothing of Originall ſinne from Adam, which may be clenſed with the lauer of regeneration &c. Anathema.* And the like is taught in ſundry other (10) Councells. And agreably (11) all Catholikes now beleiue, the neceſſity of Baptiſme to be ſo great, as that Children dying without it cannot be ſaued, nor others of yeares of Diſcretion without it, or the deſire thereof.

(6) L. 3. Decret. de S. Baptiſmate.
(7) Gal. 3. 27.
(8) Conc. Conſtantinop. 2. Vniuerſale in Symbolo.
(9) Conc. 2. Mileuit. cap. 2.
(10) Conc. Conſtantinenſe Seſſ. 12. Florent. Decret. Eugenij Papæ. Conc. Lateran. 4. Oecum. cap. 1.

Pointes Diſputable.

Some (12) writers teach, that infants dying without Baptiſme are damned with Eternall death, but yet ſo puniſhed with the want of the ſight of God, as that they ſuffer no payne internall, nor externall. (13) Others thinke, they haue paine internall through the want of eternall happines. (14) Others more ſeuere, thinke they are tormented with *Pœna damni*, and *Pœna ſenſus*, that is, with internall payne for want of Beatitude, and externall with fire and other puniſhments.

(12) Bellar. de Bapt. l. 1. c. 4. &c. Rhem. Teſt. in Ioan. 3. 5.
(13) S. Tho. in 4. q. 5. de malo ar. 1. 2. 3. and he, and others in 2. Sent. Diſt. 33.
(14) Greg. Arimineſ. in 2. Sent.

Some (15) thinke, that the Inuocation of one Diuine perſon, eſpecially of Chriſt to be ſufficient for Baptiſme. But others (16) teach, that in that caſe Baptiſme is to be reiterated, eyther abſolutly, or conditionally. And this is

(15) Pet. Lomb. in 2. l. Sent. Diſt. 33.

Diſt 33. q. 1. Driedo in 1. l. de gra. & lib. arb. tract. 2. c. 2. (15) Hugo de S. Victore l. 2. de Sacram. par. 8. c. 2. Magiſter. l. 4. Sent. Diſt. 3. (16) See many Schoolmen in 4. Diſt. 3.

more probable. But none of these are defined by the Church.

Protestant Vntruthes.

(17) In Antidoto Conc. Trid. Sess. 7 Can. 13.

(18) In Apol. art. 2.

All the Godly (sayth (17) Caluin) *complaine, or at least grone, that in Baptisme Christe, wine, salt, finally spittle to be more esteemed, then the lauer of water, wherin the whole perfection of Baptisme consisteth:* But this is so vntrue, that all Catholickes believe Baptisme with water without these to suffice to Iustification, and that these are only holy Ceremonies, not any thing essentiall: and that water is essentially necessary.

(19) Assert. Art. 2.

(20) L. 2 de Nupt. & concup. c. 25.

(21) Gratianus Dist. 4. de Consecrat. Can. Per Baptismum.

(22) Def. of the Art. art. 27. p. 268.

(23) Captiuit. Babyl. c. de Bap.

(24) Ad Vrbanum Rhegium. de Orig. Pec.

(25) Swingl. l. de vera & fal. relig. Bucerus in c. 3. Math. Caluinus Antidot. Concil. Trid. ad Sess. 5. c. 3. & Inst. l. 4. c. 16 §. 24. §. 25.

Melancthon affirmeth S. Austine to say, (18) *Sinne is remitted in Baptisme, not that it is not, but that it is not imputed. Here he plainly confesseth sinne to be, that is, to remayne, although it be not imputed. And this opinion so pleased later writers that it is recited also in the Decrees.* And the same is auouched also by Luther. (19) But it pleaseth Heretickes to be lyars and corrupters, for S. Austines owne wordes truly set downe are these, (20) *If it be demanded, how this Concupiscence remayneth in the regenerate, in whom there is made remission of all sinnes? It is answered, the Concupiscence of the flesh to be forgiuen in Baptisme, not that it is not, but that it is not imputed to sinne.* And as for the Decrees, there is not any one (21) which affirmeth sinne, but only Concupiscence to remayne after Baptisme. Hence also appeareth Rogers grosse vntruth, affirming that according to our Catholicke Doctrine, (22) *Baptisme serueth to the putting away of Originall sinne only.* But it seemes M. Rogers little knoweth what is Catholicke Doctrine.

Protestant Doctrine.

Luther teacheth, that (23) *Baptisme iustifieth none, nor profitteth any, but faith vpon the word of Promise, to which Baptisme is added, this doth iustify, and fulfill that which Baptisme signifieth.* Zwinglius affirmeth that, (24) *By the lauer of Baptisme no sinne at all is taken away.* And (25) he, and others thinke, that it is not necessary to the remission of Originall sinne, or eternall

Salua-

Saluation. Yea they thinke, the Children of the faithfull without Baptiſme to be Saintes, and members of the Church, and though they ſo dye, yet to be ſaued.

In ſo much, that Zwinglius thinketh Baptiſme to be only (26) *a Ceremony, which the Church may omit, and duly take away.* And according to Whitaker, (27) *It is lawfull to abſtaine from Baptiſme, ſo that in this fact there be no Contempt and ſcandall.* And he plainly auoucheth, that, (28) *The ſaluation of Infants doth not depend of the Sacraments.* They alſo teach, that there is no difference betwene the Baptiſme of Iohn, and the Baptiſme of Chriſt. Whitaker ſaith, (29) *It was the ſame Ceremony, the ſame doctrine, the ſame Grace.* Beza (30) *I ſay, that indeed it is the ſame, and one Baptiſme, miniſtred firſt by Iohn, afterwardes by the Commandement of Chriſt.* Wherfore according to Prot. Baptiſme is not neceſſary to ſaluation, but may be omitted, or taken away, ſo that it be without Contempt or ſcandall.

(26) *De Baptiſ. tom. 2. fol. 96.*
(27) *Controu. 4. q. 7. c. 2. p. 716.*
(28) *Controu. 2. q. 2. c. 8. p. 376. & cont. Dur. fol. 8. ſect. 73.*
(29) *Ad rat. 8. Camp. pe 40.*
(30) *L. quæſt. & reſp. p. 144. Colu. in Luc. 3. 3.*

Proteſtants agree with Ancient Hereticks.

The Pelagians were condemned by S. Auſtine, (31) for teaching that children might haue *lyfe euerlaſting, although they were not baptized.* This Error is ſo certaine in them, that it is confeſſed, and reported by the Centuriſtes (32) and (33) Sarcerius.

(31) *Cont. 3. Col. 381.*
(32) *Loc. com fol. 88.*
(33) *Synop. p. 415. Pulk ag. Purgat. p. 350.*

D. (34) Willet, Fulke, and many other Prot. denying remiſſion of ſinnes and Grace to be giuen by Baptiſme, are condemned in the Manichees, by the acknowledgment of D. Whitaker, ſaying of himſelfe and ſome other Prot. (35) *We believe and teach that ſinnes are forgiuen, and Grace conferred in Baptiſme, which the Manichees were accuſtomed to deny.*

(34) *Cont. Dur. l. 10. p. 883. Sarcer. loc. com. To. 2. de bap. fol. 232.*

S. Epiphanius (36) condemneth Cerinthus, for teaching that a man may be ſaued without Baptiſme: which Error was alſo maintained by (37) Mahomet..

(35) *Hær. 28.*
(36) *Præteolus verb. Mahometes.*

The deniall of *Exorciſme and Exuffiation* vſed by Catholickes in Baptiſme, and reiected by Prot. was condemned by S. Auſtine (38) in Iulian the Pelagian. *Iulian* (ſayth he) *reprocheth the moſt ancient Tradition of the Church, wherby children are Exorciſed, and breathed vpon.* And M. Parker alleadgeth

(37) *Contreu. 4. q. 7. c. 2. p. 716.*
(38) *De Nupt. & Concup. l. 2. c. 29. & c. 17. &*

Nazianzen (39) reporting that, *Iulian laught at the ſuffiations of Baptiſme.* And yet all Prot. are content to laugh with him, and therfore muſt be content to be cenſured with him.

Proteſtants Errours.

Beza teacheth that, (40) *If water be wanting and the Baptiſme of any one cannot, or ought not with Edification to be differred, that then in any other liquour he may Baptize, as duly as in water.* Luther (41) being asked whether water being wanting, it was lawfull to baptize in milke or beere, anſwered firſt, that it was to be referred to Gods iudgment: but afterwards he added, that whatſoeuer might be called by the name of Bathe, that was fit for Baptiſme. Now, no man doubteth, but that there may be bathes of wyne, milke or beere. Polanus teacheth that, (42) *The externall & ſenſible matter of Baptiſme is water, or that wanting, other like liquour.* And the ſame is taught by ſundry other (43) Proteſtantes.

Luther thinketh that, (44) *In what manner ſoeuer Baptiſme be giuen, ſo that it be not giuen in the name of man, but in the name of the Lord, it doth truly ſaue: Yea I do not doubt, if any one ſhall receiue it in the name of the Lord, although the wicked Miniſter do not giue it in the name of the Lord, him to be truly Baptized in the name of the Lord.*

I am not Ignorant (ſaith (45) Zwinglius) *the Apoſtles not to haue taken theſe words (In the name of the Father &c.) for ſuch, as without which Baptiſme could not conſiſt.* And ſundry other Prot. (46) do teach, that the forme of Baptiſme, with Inuocation of the *Father, the Sonne, and the holy Ghoſt*, is not neceſſary or eſſentiall.

Luther (47) taught, that Infants Baptized had actuall faith.

Luther, (48) Caluin, and other Prot. defend that ſinnes committed after Baptiſme, are forgiuen by the memory and faith of the Baptiſme formerly receiued. Wherof Perkins ſaith, (49) *In Baptiſme once miniſtred remiſſion is giuen not only of ſinnes paſt but alſo of preſent, and to be, through the whole life.*

They likewiſe teach, that Children are borne Chriſtians

cent. Inſt. Petrg. l. 6 c. 2.

(39) *Againſt Symbolizing. Part. 1. ſect. 23. p. 152. & Part. 2. ſect. 9. p. 131.*

(40) *Ep. ſua Theologica ad Thomæ Tilio.*

(41) *In Colloquiis Symposiacis c. 27.*

(42) *In Syllog theſ. part. 2. p. 556.*

(43) *Hunnius in diſput. 45. p. 273. Vorſtius in Antibel. p. 367.*

(44) *De Capt. Babyl. Tom. 2. fol. 75.*

(45) *Tom. 2. ad Hrutbionem. fol. 322. & de Bap. fol. 66. 67.*

(46) *Calu. de vera Eccleſ. reform. p. 325. Vorſtius in Antibel. p. 361. Polanus in Diſp. priuat. diſp. 30.*

(47) *L. de Captiuit. Ba-*

tians before they be Baptized; ſo Zwinglius, (50) *Children of Chriſtians are within the Church and the body of Chriſt, euen before they be baptized.* Caluin, (51) *I ſay the Children of the Godly are borne the ſonnes of the Church, and from the wombe are reputed amongſt the members of Chriſt.* (52) *They belonged to the body of Chriſt before they were brought to light,* and according to Perkins, (53) *The children of the faythfull are borne holy.* But Zwinglius teacheth the ſame concerning the Children of Infidels, (54) *I leaue to the Iudgement of the Omnipotent and iuſt God, Children who are borne of Parents not beleeuing, although I can fynd no cauſe of Damnation in them:* (55) *We rashly condemne Children borne of Chriſtian parents, yea the Children alſo of Gentiles.* And the ſame is taught by (56) other Proteſtants.

By this we ſee what poore eſteeme Prot. make of Baptiſme, neither thinking *water* to be neceſſary, nor the words *In the name of the Father &c.* and that *Children*, may be ſaued without it, *being borne Chriſtians*, euen the *Children of Infidels.*

byl. c. de Bap. & l. cons. Cochlæum & l. ad Waldenſes.

(48) L. de Captiuit. Babyl. c. de Bap. Calu. Inſtit. l. 4. c. 15. ſ. 3. 4.

(49) Tom. 2. in ſerie cauſarum. c. 33. Col. 77. Zanchius in Confeſſ. c. 15. col. 517.

(50) Tom. 4. in 1. Cor. 12. p. 477.

(51) In Act. 8. 17.

(52) De reform. Eccleſ. p. 147.

(53) Tom. 2. in Gal. 2. 15. Col. 83.

(54) Tom. 2. de Bap. fol. 91.

(55) De ratione fidei. fol. 540.

(56) See Vorſtius in Antibel. p. 542. Hemingius in Enchyr. cloſſ. 3. p. 322.

SECT. II.

It is proued by Scriptures that Baptiſme is neceſſary to Saluation.

CHriſt our Sauiour auoucheth, that (1) *Vnles a man be borne agayne of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdome of God.* Which wordes as S. Auſtine (2) demonſtrateth, do not only ſignify a Precept, but euen the meanes neceſſary for the entring into the Kingdome of God. This place taken litterally, conuinceth the neceſſity of Baptiſme: wherfore Prot. to euade the force thereof, are enforced to deny the ſayd wordes to be ſo much as vnderſtood of Baptiſme: and ſo heere by *water*, they vnderſtand only the *holy Ghoſt*, & the ſenſe they make this, *vnleſſe a man be borne agayne of water*, that is, *of the holy Ghoſt*, who cleanſeth lyke water &c. To which end they alſo alledge theſe words, (3) *He ſhall baptize you in the holy Ghoſt and fyre*, where by *fyre*, they vnderſtand the ſaid holy Ghoſt, as he hath a ſimilitude with fyre. Thus Bullinger and Caluin expound this place, and therefore ſayth

(1) Io. 3. 5.

(2) De pec. mer. & rem. l. 1. c. 30.

(1) *Mat.* 11.

(4) *Inſt. l.* 4. *c.* 16. *ſect.* 25.

(5) In his Decades. p. 1408. init.

(6) *Ag. Rh. Teſt. in lo.* 3. *ſect.* 2. *f.* 143.

(7) *Loc. com. Anglic.*

(8) *Cons. Duræum. l.* 8. *p.* 676.

(9) *Act.* 2. 1.

(10) *Act.* 2. 3.

(11) Edit. an. 1576. and the marginall Citations in Luc. 3. 16. where is cited Act. 2. 5. & Act. 15. 16. See alſo in the ſame Bible the Marg. citat. in Act 15. 16. where alſo is cited Mat. 3. 11. & Luc. 3. 16.

(12) *In his Eccl. Pol. ſect.* 59. *p.* 231.

ſayth Caluin, (4) *Falluntur* &c. *They are deceiued, who thinke mention to be made of Baptiſme in this place, becauſe they heare the name of water*; with whom agreeth Bullinger, (5) Fulke, (6) Peter Martyr, (7) and D. Whitaker, (8) all of them affirming, vnder the name of *water*, nothing elſe but the *holy Ghoſt* to be ſignifyed.

But this reply is moſt abſurd, and falſe. Firſt, in that the forſaid place of S. Iohn is vnderſtood of Baptiſme by the Ancient Fathers, as will appeare in the Section following. Secondly, by the like liberty of Expoſition, we may vtterly deny the Sacrament of Baptiſme at all, vnderſtanding alwayes by the name of *water*, the *holy Ghoſt*, and in like ſort it is moſt eaſy to peruert all the miſteries of our faith. Thirdly, the comparing it with that other Example of Baptizing in the holy Ghoſt and fyre is impertinent, for that the word, *Fyre*, may be taken properly, and is, without further queſtion, moſt rightly vnderſtood of the Externall fyre, which viſibly deſcended vpon the Apoſtles, vpon *the* (9) *day of Pentecoſt, in clouen* (10) *tongues, as it were of fyre:* and ſo our Sauiour foretelling the ſame, calleth it expreſly their *Baptiſme*, which is ſo plaine a performance of S. Iohn Baptiſtes prediction of our Sauiour his Baptizing of his Apoſtles with *fyre*, that the very Engliſh Bible (11) in the Marginall citations, ouer againſt both the ſaid places, doth make a mutuall relation, reference, and citation of the one place vnto the other. In ſo much as M. Hooker (12) and other Proteſtant writers affirme, that *the Baptiſme of fyre meant by Iohn, was really performed by the forſaid viſible deſcent of fyre.*

Fourthly, though the word (*fyre*) ſhould not here ſignify materiall fyre, as is aforeſaid, but only the *holy Ghoſt*; yet it is impertinent to proue, that the word *Water*, in the other place ſhould be ſo likewiſe vnderſtood: for wheras the expoſition doth ordinarily follow the thing which is to be expounded, the word *fyre* being placed next after the, *holy Ghoſt*, might therby the rather be taken improperly, as to explaine the word, *Holy Ghoſt*, in ſignifying the purifying effectes therof: but in the other place the word, *Water*, is placed before the *holy Ghoſt*, and therfore cannot be taken as a

like

like Expoſition therof, nor without great abſurdity be ſaid to be an Explication, of the cleanſing effectes therof. Fiftly, wheras Nicodemus did miſvnderſtand our Sauiours firſt wordes of (*a man to be borne againe*) and asked our Sauiour, (13) *how it could be?* our Sauiour thervpon anſwering (with the forſaid wordes now in queſtion) therby to explaine to Nicodemus his owne firſter ſaying, and to ſatisfy his demand, muſt needs be thought to vſe the word *Water*, properly, for otherwiſe he had rather obſcured, then explained his former ſaying, and not ſo much haue ſatisfyed, as increaſed Nicodemus his doubt. Sixtly, for as much as the Scripture elſwhere calleth Baptiſme, *the* (14) *lauer of Regeneration*, or being borne againe, that therfore the other forſaid mention of our being regenerate, or borne againe of water, being in termes ſo anſwerable therto, is in like manner to be vnderſtood of Baptiſme. Seauenthly, this point is ſo euident, that aſwell the Ancient Fathers (euen by the Proteſtants owne (15) Confeſſion) as alſo the (16) Prot. learned writers, do take the word, *Water*, properly, and ſo do vnderſtand the ſaid place of Baptiſme: in ſo much as M. Hooker (17) mentioning the forefaid conference, or obiection of the *holy Ghoſt*, and (18) *Fyre*, anſwereth the ſame notwithſtanding, that the forſaid ſaying of our being borne againe of Water, *is according to the generall conſent of Antiquity*, to be vnderſtood *of externall Baptiſme*, and termeth it a (19) *Critticall conceipt* to expound is otherwiſe. Danæus, to auoyd the force (20) of theſe words, expoundeth them thus, *Vnles a man be borne againe of water, and the holy Ghoſt*, the particle Et, *and*, *is to be taken for the diſiunctiue*, Aut, *or*, (ſayth he.) But this is meerly his owne fiction, and by the like liberty a man may affirme or deny any thing from the Scripture: Yea according to this Expoſition, it were ſufficient to be baptized with water without the holy Ghoſt, which is moſt impious to affirme.

Others yet reply, that although the forſaid place be vnderſtood of Baptiſme, yet it proueth no further the neceſſity therof, then doth this like ſaying, (21) *Vnles you eate the fleſh of the ſonne of man &c. you ſhall not haue lyfe in you*; which eating doth not include any ſuch neceſſity. But the Com-

(13) Io. 3. 4.
(14) Tit. 3. 5.
(15) Hook. Eccl. Pol. l. 5. ſect. 59 p. 130.
(16) Luth. in his Ser. Enlished. p. 145. Conf. of Sax in the Harm. pag. 405. of Bohem. pag. 339. Hoſman de pœna l. 3. c. 4. p. 229. Nowels Catech. p. 141. Bilſon in his true differ. part. 4. p. 168. Aret. loc. 40. p. 136. Danæus Iſag. Chriſt. l. 5. de Sacra. c. 39.
(17) Hook. vbi ſup. ſect. 59 p. 130.
(18) Hook. ibid.
(19) Ibid. pag. 130. in fine.
(20) Tom. 2. Controu. de Bap. c. 4. p. 321.
(21) Io. 6. 53.

 pariſon

pariſon is vnlike, for our Sauiour ſayth not ſo generally, vn-
(22) Io.3.5. leſſe one eate the flesh, as he ſaid before, (22) *Vnles one be borne a-gaine of water*, for he ſaith but, *vnles you eate the flesh*, directing ſo his ſpeeches to thoſe that were of diſcretion and capable of his Commandements, and ſo this place pertayneth not to Infants; wheras the other firſter ſaying, being generall, and without limitation, muſt needs comprehend them. Againe the wordes obiected, whether they be taken in the Proteſtant ſenſe of eating Chriſtes fleſh, to wit, the effectes and merit of his Paſſion by fayth, or in our ſenſe of receiuing really Chriſtes fleſh in the Sacrament, contayneth after either ſenſe, a neceſſity in it, and therfore make againſt Prot. that vrge them: for being taken in their ſenſe, they imply a neceſſity, in that they thinke faith abſolutly needfull. And being taken in our ſenſe, they do the like: for both Prot. and Catholickes thinke, that ſuch as be of Diſcretion, whom only theſe wordes concerne, are vnder paine of ſinne, bound to receyue the Sacrament, and cannot be excuſed from this neceſſity, but only when in ſtraites of tyme, when the Sacrament cannot be had, the parties owne effectuall deſire, which is in wanting in Infants, is in Gods mercy accepted, inſteed therof: As alſo in the like caſe, the ſame ſupplieth the place of Baptiſme, and the performance of all other like Commandementes.

The Scriptures alſo aſcribe remiſſion of ſinnes, and Saluation to Baptiſme, (23) *He that believeth, and is baptized, ſhalbe ſaued:* (24) *Do pennance and be euery one of you baptized in the name of Ieſus Chriſt for remiſsion of your ſinnes:* (25) *ryſe vp and be baptized, and waſh away thy ſinnes, inuocating his name:* (26) *he hath ſaued vs by the lauer of regeneration*; and ſundry (27) other ſuch like: which textes are ſo plaine for the neceſſity of Baptiſme to remiſſion of ſinnes that Zwinglius inſteed of all other anſwere, moſt wickedly writeth thus: (28) *How foolish would he ſeeme, who for the wordes* (of Scripture) *ſhould contend that we are waſhed from ſinnes by the water of Baptiſme?* But if it be fooliſhnes to believe Articles of fayth, becauſe the Scriptures wordes are plaine for them; I do not know wherin the wiſdome of a Proteſtant will conſiſt, who vſually denieth

(23) Mar. 16. 16.
(24) Act. 2. 38.
(25) Act. 22. 27.
(26) Tit. 3. 5.
(27) Epheſ. 5. 26 1. Pet 3. 21.
(28) Tom. 2. de pec. orig. fol. 122.

nieth all other proofe, but only Scripture.

But it wilbe worth the laughing to heare Zwinglius expound the forſaid places, (29) *Thou* (ſayth he) *ſeeſt here, 1. Pet. 3. Baptiſme ſaueth vs. Firſt, Baptiſme is to be taken for faith.* And, (30) *He knew that they were by Apollo baptized, that is, taught.* Againe, (31) *It is to be noted, the word, Baptizing, in theſe wordes of Paul, Act. 16. to be taken for doctrine.* And (32) *Baptiſme, 1. Pet. 3. is taken for Chriſt, when he ſayth, we are ſaued by Baptiſme.* And, (33) *They haue learned often of vs, by, Water, in this place* (Io. 3.) *ought to be vnderſtood the knowledge of Chriſt, and the comfort of ſayth*: So that in none of theſe places muſt be vnderſtood by Baptiſme, the Sacrament, but either ſayth, teaching, doctrine, Chriſt, or what you will, ſo that it be not the Sacrament of Baptiſme.

(29) Tom. 1. Ep. ad Lindouerum. fol. 204.
(30) Tom 2. fol. 202. l. de Relig. cap. de Bap.
(31) L. de Bap. fol. 68.
(32) In ſubſidio Ibid. fol. 234.
(33) To. 2. l. de Bap. fol. 73.

But the beſt refuge that Proteſtants haue againſt cleere textes, is to corrupt them. And ſo becauſe theſe wordes of S. Paul, (34) *According to his mercy he hath ſaued vs by the lauer of Regeneration &c.* do proue that Baptiſme doth concurre to the working of our Saluation; the Geneuians do take away theſe wordes, *He hath ſaued vs*, and haue placed them in the verſe precedent, where they do not ſo cleerly make againſt them. This is their ſureſt way of anſwering, by chopping, changing, adding, taking away, as their need ſhall require.

(34) Tit. 3. 5.

Laſtly the neceſſity of Baptiſme is proued by ouerthrowing the Proteſtantes contrary ground, who therfore thinke Baptiſme not to be neceſſary, becauſe according to them, the Children of belieuing Parentes are borne free, though not from Originall ſinne it ſelfe, yet from the guilt therof, it being not imputed vnto them. But this to be falſe, it appeareth firſt, in that Iacob and Eſau were both the ſonnes of holy Iſaac, and yet God loued (35) Iacob and hated Eſau, *before they had done any good or euill.* Secondly the places of S. Paul for Originall ſinne are generall, viz. (36) *in which all haue ſinned:* (37) *As in Adam all dye, ſo alſo in Chriſt all ſhalbe made alyue.* Neither can it be ſaid, that thoſe places are to be vnderſtood of the vice of nature, not of the guilt, for then none ſhould haue had the ſame guilt of ſinne. Neither can it be ſaid, the ſonnes of the faithfull to contract Originall

(35) Rom. 9. 11. 13.
(36) Rom. 5. 12.
(37) 1. Cor. 15. 22.

sinne, but forthwith the sinne to be forgiuen them before they be borne: for if they be therfore sanctifyed, because they are the sonnes of the faithfull, then in the same moment they begin to be holy, wherin they begin to be the sonnes of the faythfull: but in the same moment wherin they beginne to haue being, they beginne to be the sonnes of the faithfull; therfore they neuer haue Originall sinne, which is against the Prot. themselues, who admit the same, and yet do not obserue that they contradict themselues. Lastly the (said ground is against a generall (38) principle giuen by the Ancient Fathers, which is, that *we are not borne, but made Christians*, which were most false, if without Baptisme we were Christians, by being only borne of Christian Parentes.

(38) Tertul. in Apolog. & c 17 Hieron. Ep. 7 ad Lætam.

SECT. III.

That the Ancient Fathers do expound the sacred Scriptures in proofe of the necessity of Baptisme.

NOw that the foresayd cleerest texts of Scripture are answerably expounded by the Fathers; we fynd, that Clemens Romanus maketh this demand, (1) *But you say peraduenture; what doth the Baptisme of water conferre to the worship of God? first of all truly, it is accomplished, because it pleased God: secondly, because the frailty of our former Nativity, which is made yours by man is cut of to one regenerated of water, and borne of God, and so at last you may come to Saluation, otherwise it is impossible. For so the true Prophet hath testifyed vnto vs, with the Sacrament, saying; verily I say vnto you, vnles one be borne againe of liuing water, he shall not inter into the Kingdome of heauen: And therefore hasten you to it, for there is in these waters a certayne mercy of him, which mercy was carryed vpon the waters from the beginning: and he (viz. the holy Ghost) doth acknowledge them who are baptized vnder the Appellation or name of the threefold Sacrament (he meaneth the mystery of the B. Trinity) and doth deliuer them from torments to come offering the Soules consecrated by Baptisme, as a certayne guift vnto God:*

(1) Epist. 4.

fly

fly therefore to theſe waters, for they are they alone, which can quench the rage of the fyre to come, vnto which waters whoſoeuer lingreth to come, it is euident that the Idoll of Infidelity doth yet remayne in him and that he is forbidden of that Idoll to haſten to the waters which conferre Saluation. Here according to S. Clements expoſition of the Scriptures, Baptiſme giueth Saluation, deliuereth from Hell, and that it is Infidelity not to haſten to that Sacrament.

With S. Clement agreeth S. Iuſtinus Martyr, writing thus, (2) *Afterwardes the Catechumens are brought thither by vs where water is, and are regenerated with that manner of Regeneration, wherewithall we our ſelues are regenerated: for in the name of the Father of all things, and of our Sauiour Ieſus Chriſt, and of the holy ſpirit, they are then waſhed in water, for Chriſt himſelfe hath ſaid: Vnles you be regenerated of water and the ſpirit, you ſhall not enter into the kingdome of heauen &c. ſince that being Ignorant of our former byrth by a certaine neceſsity &c. and brought vp in euill manners and naughty Cuſtome, that we may not remaine Children of neceſsity and Ignorance, but ſonnes of Election and knowledge, and may obtaine in water remiſsion of our ſinnes formerly committed &c.* Thus from the wordes of Chriſt Iuſtinus proueth Baptiſme to obtaine remiſſion of ſinnes.

(2) *Orat. 2. ad Antonium.*

Conſonant vnto theſe forſaid Fathers S. Gregory teacheth moſt plainly that, (3) *whoſoeuer is not looſed by the water of regeneration, he is held bound with the bands of the firſt guilt, for what the water of Baptiſme is able to do with vs, this did in former ages, either ſole faith for little ones, or the vertue of Sacrifice for great ones or the miſtery of Circumciſion for thoſe who were of the Stocke of Abraham, for that euery one is conceiued with the ſinne of his firſt Father, the Prophet witneſſeth ſaying,* (4) *Behould I am conceiued in iniquity, and in ſinne hath my mother conceiued me, and that he whom the water of Saluation doth not waſh, doth not eſcape the puniſhment, truth witneſſeth of himſelfe, ſaying, vnles a man be borne againe of water and the holy Ghoſt, he ſhall not haue life eternall.* To conclude this place of S. Iohn is vnderſtood of the Sacrament of Baptiſme by many others of the learneſt (5) Fathers.

(3) *L. 4. Moral. c. 3.*
(4) *Pſ. 50. 7.*
(5) *Iuſtin. Mart. Apol. 2. Tert. l. de Bap. Cyp. l. 3. ad Quir. c. 25. Amb. l. 3. de SS. c. 11. Hieron in c. 9. Ezech. Baſil. Nazianzen. Nyſſen. in Ser. de Bap. Orig. Chryſoſt. Aug. Cyr. Bed. Theophil. Euthymius & alij in hunc loc.*

S. Auſtine demandeth, (6) *what Chriſtian may abyde when it is ſaid, that one may be ſaued, though he be not borne againe in* (6) *Aug. de pec. mer. & rem. l. c. 23. & 24.*

Christ, which Christ would haue to be done by Baptisme &c. Wherefore the Apostle sayth &c. He hath saued vs by the lauer of Regeneration.

S. Austine is so cleere for (7) Baptisme, washing away all sinnes, altogeather, of deeds, words, thoughts, or originall, as that the (8) Centurists and Chemnitius do alledge sundry his sayings, and confesse his Iudgement in our behalfe. But Zwinglius confesseth of the Fathers in generall thus: (9) *Heer most of the Doctours vnderstanding by the name of water, that materiall and externall water of Baptisme, haue attributed vnto it, much more then was fit, whereupon it afterwards came to passe, that they ascribed the clensing of soules to the Element of water.* Of which also saith Luther, (10) *I excuse the Fathers who driuen eyther by temptation or necessity, stoutly denyed sinne to remaine after Baptisme.*

And as concerning the necessity of Baptisme, S. Austine auoucheth that, (11) *If thou wilt be a Catholike, do not believe, do not say, do not teach, that Children dying before they be baptized, can come to forgiuenes of Originall sinnes,* (12) *And whosoeuer sayth, that Children shalbe reuiued in Christ, who dye without participation of this Sacrament, this man truly contradicteth the Apostolicall preaching, and condemneth the whole Church &c.* And, though, (13) *it may be truly sayd, that children dying without Baptisme are to be, in damnatione omnium leuissima, in the easyest state of damnation: yet he deceiueth, and is deceyued, who teacheth that they are not to be damned.* These sayings are so vnanswerable in S. Austine, that Mr. Cartwright confesseth, that (14) *Austine was of mynd, that children could not be saued without Baptisme:* for which he impudently chargeth him, (15) *with absurdity.* And for the same Doctrine is S. Austine reproued by other (16) Protestants. Yea the Fathers were so resolute heerin, that as Caluin testifyeth (17) *It was vsuall many ages since, euen almost from the beginning of the Church, that in danger of death lay people might Baptize, if the minister was not present in due tyme.* Cartwrigh also acknowledgeth that, (18) *Austine doth seeme to allow of the Baptisme of a lay man, in tyme of necessity.* And Whitguift confesseth that, (19) *Austine doth say, that a lay man may baptize in tyme of necessity.* And D. Bilson auoucheth that, (20) *The denying*

(7) Cent. 2. Ep. Pelag. l. 3. c. 3.
(8) Cent. 5. c. 4. Col. 168. Chemn. Exa. part. 2. p. 38.
(9) Tom. 2. de Bap. fol. 76.
(10) Tom. 2. Wittem. fol. 229.
(11) De anima & eius origine l. 3. c. 9. & de Verb. Ap. Ser. 14.
(12) Ep. 28. ad Hieron.
(13) De pec. mor. & remiss. l. 2. c. 28.
(14) In Whiteg. def. p. 521.
(15) Ib. p. 516.
(16) Bulling. in his Decad. in Engl. Dec. 5. ser. 8. Musculus, loc. com. c. de Bap. Dilingæ. de Symb. p. 45. Centurist. cent. 5. c. 4. col. 379.
(17) Inst. l. 4. c. 15 sect. 20.
(18) In V Whiteg. Def. p. 522.
(19) Ib. p. 523.

uying of priuat perſons in caſe of neceſsity to baptize, were to troſſe all Antiquity. Thus cleerly teach the Fathers the neceſſity of Baptiſme, confirming the ſame from the ſacred Scriptures.

(10) Confer at Hampton Court. p. 18.

SECT. IV.

That Proteſtant Writers do teach and defend the Catholicke Doctrine of the neceſsity of Baptiſme.

MHookers beliefe is, that, (1) *Originall ſinne is purged by Baptiſme*; and M. Bilſon acknowledgeth, (2) that, *Originall ſinne is not remitted but by Baptiſme*. Now if Originall ſinne be purged by Baptiſme, according to M. Hooker, if Originall ſinne be not remitted but by Baptiſme in the Iudgment of M. Bilſon, the Conſequence according to them is ineuitable, that Baptiſme muſt be neceſſary vnto Saluation. And this they proue alſo by thoſe former places of Scripture, which haue bene vrged. Chemnitius teacheth that, (3) *God doth not ſaue vs without meanes, but by the lauer of Regeneration. Tit. 3.* And, (4) *Baptiſme is a meane or Inſtrument by which is made the Communication of Chriſtes benefits, for by Baptiſme Chriſt cleanſeth and ſanctifyeth. Eph. 5.* Yea ſayth he, (5) *The teſtimonies of Scriptures are manifeſt, which as they cannot be denied, ſo they ought not to be ſhifted of. Tit. 3. Baptiſme is called the lauer of Regeneration. Eph. 5. Cleanſing her with the lauer of water in the word. Io. 3. Vnles one be borne againe of water &c. Act. 22. Be baptized and waſh away thy ſinnes. 1. Pet. 3. ſpeaking of water &c. he ſayth, Baptiſme being of the like forme* (to wit of the Arke of Noe) *ſaueth vs.* And hence he concludeth, *Theſe being moſt manifeſt teſtimonies, which expreſly aſcribe Efficacy to Sacramentes, and declare what that* (efficacy) *is, are not to be peruerted by tropes* (as other Prot. vſe to do) *from their ſimple and native ſignification, which the proper ſignification of the wordes giueth, and ſo the Ancient* (Fathers) *haue vnderſtood theſe teſtimonies ſimply, as they ſound.* So abſolute is Chemnitius, prouing our Catholicke Doctrine, from ſo many teſtimonies of Scripture, and the anſwerable Interpretation therof made by the Fathers.

(1) *Eccl. pol. l. 5. p. 154.*
(2) In his true difference part. 4. p. 368.
(3) *Exam. part. 2. p. 53. & 17.*
(4) *Ibid. p. 53.*
(5) *Ibid. p. 20.*

Vrbanus Regius affirmeth (6) *That the Scripture, and the authe-*

(6) *In. 2. part. operum in Catechiſmo minori. f. 105.*

authority of the Ancient Church conſtraine him to beleeue, that little children dying vnbaptized are damned.

Mr. Hofman (commended by (7) Melanchon & Brenius) ſayth expreſly, (8) *Ideo certum eſt &c. It is therefore right and Godly that the ſinnes of Infants be waſhed away by the Churches Miniſtery by Baptiſme; ſeeing that without this Laver of Regeneration, they cannot be ſaued.* D. Biſſon alſo concludeth from S. Auſtine & the Scriptures (9) *that if children be excluded from Baptiſme, they be likewiſe excluded from the Kingdome of God, & that without Baptiſme they cannot be ſaued, by reaſon Originall ſin is not remitted, but in Baptiſme.* This Doctrine of the neceſſity of Baptiſme for the Saluation of children is further taught by (10) Erasmus Sarcerius, & by the Confeſſion of (11) Auſpurge, where it is taught, that, *Baptiſme is neceſſary to Saluation as a Ceremony ordained by Chriſt.* Alſo that *by Baptiſme the grace of God is offered.* And *that young Infants are to be baptized, and that they being by Baptiſme commended vnto God, are receyued into Gods fauour, & are made the ſons of God as Chriſt witneſſeth, ſpeaking of little children in the Church, Mat. 18. It is not the will of your heauenly father, that any of theſe little ones ſhould periſh. They condemne the Anabaptiſts, which allow not the Baptiſme of Infants, & hould that infants are ſaued, though they dye without Baptiſme, and be not within the Church of God.* The Prot. alſo of Saxony confeſſe the ſame in theſe words (12) *That the holy Ghoſt is giuen in Baptiſme, Paul affirmeth in his Epiſtle to Titus, ſaying, By the waſhing of the new birth, and the renewing of the holy Ghoſt. And in Iohn 3 it ſayd, Except a man be borne agayne of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdome of heauen. Therefore we teach that Baptiſme is neceſſary &c.*

To theſe I might add ſundry (13) Proteſtant writers: in ſo much as Peter Martyr doth therefore reprehend certayne of his Brethren, becauſe ſayth he, (14) *They deſpayre that children can haue Saluation without Baptiſme:* And in reguard of this neceſſity many (15) Prot. do allow & defend Baptiſme miniſtred

(7) See the prefaces of Melanchon and Bren. ſet before the beginning of Hofmans booke.
(8) *In Com. de pœnit. l. 3 c. 4. de Bap. Infant f 229.*
(9) In his true diff. part. 4. Pa 368.
(10) *Loc. com. de Bap. f. 218. 239. 240.*
(11) See the Harm. of Conf. p. 401. 404.
(12) Harm. of Confeſſ. p. 401.
(13) See Chemn. par. 2. Exam. p. 52. and in his Treatiſe ag. Oſorius. p 421. See alſo Iac. Andræas cited by Beza ad Act. Col. Monſp. ep. Ded. pag. his Ep. to the Andræas in Ep. ment. de pœn. l. 2 c. 13. Cabert. in Act. mon. p. 541. Woodman lb. p. 1590. Sarc. loc. com. tom. 1. de Bap. f. 229. 230. 234. See Whitg. in his Def, p 318. 322, 323. Zwing, ib, p. 318. Bucer, ib. p. 321.

reſp. part. 2. p. 196. See alſo Conradus Scluſſelb. in Catal. hær. l. 13 & 14. (14) In collect. annexis loc com. Anglic. and there ſee Pet. Mart. Engl. Church. (15) See Scluſſelb. in Theol. Calu l. 2. f. 68. Iac. Andræas in Ep. Col. Montiab. p. 46. 58. Hook. Eccl pol. l. 5. ſect. 60. 62. Hofman Com-

miſtred by lay perſons, men or women in caſe of neceſſity.

Concerning the neceſſity of the matter and forme in Baptiſme, M. Antonius de Dominis teacheth that, (16) *In the very materiall Baptiſme, there are, by diuine expreſſe inſtitution, both things and words, becauſe Chriſt commanded that they ſhould baptize, In the name of the Father &c.* Reinectius reproueth Beza, ſaying, (17) *Beza vainly thinketh, water wanting, that it is lawfull to take other liquour*: but this he confuteth by many places of Scripture. Yea Beza himſelfe auoucheth thus for the contrary, (18) *If any one ſhould not baptize in the Trinity, or for water (eſpecially knowing) ſhould vſe I know not what other thing, altogether different, this were not truly the Baptiſme inſtituted by Chriſt*. Pareus therefore affirmeth very well, that, (19) *No Chriſtian truly doubteth, but that the Baptiſme of water ought to be adminiſtred according to Chriſts Inſtitution, only in the name of the Father &c.* So confeſſed it is euen by Prot. that Baptiſme is neceſſary to Saluation.

(16) *L. 5. de Repub. c. 5. n. 4.*

(17) *Tom. 2. Armat. c. 18. p. 101.*

(18) *L. quæſt. & reſp. vol. 3. Theol. p. 143.*

(19) *In Col. 1 theol. 9. Diſp. 22.*

SECT. V.

Obiections from Scripture, againſt the Neceſſity of Baptiſme, anſwered.

THe firſt obiection is vrged vpon occaſion of thoſe wordes of Almighty God to Abraham, (1) *I am thy God and of thy ſeed*: which wordes, ſay Prot. were ſpoken to Abraham and to his Poſterity, which we by Chriſt our Sauiour are. Anſw. Litterally this concerneth a Promiſe of peculiar Protection and worldly felicity: and though it may be vnderſtood in a myſticall ſenſe, of the ſpirituall promiſſes of remiſſion of ſinnes, and of eternall life, and the ſame to belong to vs: yet this is not by carnall generation of our Parents, but by our ſpirituall regeneration; for S. (2) Paul plainly teacheth, *thoſe to be the ſonnes of Abraham, not which are the ſonnes of the fleſh, but which are the Sonnes of fayth*; that is,

(1) *Gen. 17. 7.*

(2) *Rom 4. 11. 13. & 9. 7. 8. Galat. 3. 7. 8. 9. 29.*

who imitate the fayth of Abraham, which children do not, but when they are baptized, for to them to be (3) baptized, is to beliewe. Befids, by Carnall generation we cannot be made the ſonnes of Abraham, ſeeing our Parents deſcended not from Abraham: but becauſe Chriſt was truly the ſonne of Abraham, then alſo beginne we to be the ſonnes of Abraham, when we beginne to be the ſonnes of Brothers of Chriſt, which vndoubtedly we are not but by Baptiſme, we being alſo therfore called Chriſtians. Beſides theſe wordes no more ſeclude the neceſſity of Baptiſme, then of Repentance, or good life, they making no difference herin, but extending to all alike. Againe theſe wordes, notwithſtanding the Commandement for Infantes to be Circumciſed, did ſtrictly bynd, after the Couenant made with Abraham.

(3) *Aug. l. 1. de pec. merit. & remiſſ. c. 27.*

A ſecond Obiection is from thoſe wordes, (4) *The man, an Infidell is ſanctifyed by the faithfull woman, and the woman an Infidell is ſanctifyed by the faithfull husband, otherwiſe your children ſhould be vncleane, but now they are holy*: therfore Children borne of faithfull Parents, are holy without Baptiſme. Anſw. In the like ſenſe that the Children here are ſaid to be ſanctifyed and holy, is the Infidell husband or wyfe ſaid to be ſanctifyed, and yet none belieueth that the Infidell husband by only liuing with the faithfull wyfe, without conuerſion to God and Baptiſme can be ſaued: and therfore this place doth no more proue the Saluation of Children without Baptiſme, though borne of a belieuing mother, then it doth proue the ſaluation of the vnbelieuing husband without Baptiſme, who by this Text is no leſſe ſanctifyed then are the Children. And therfore howſoeuer this place may import the legall Sanctity of the Marriage, and that the Children are borne holy, that is to ſay in wedlocke, yet to the ſaluation of Children without Baptiſme, this is a very forlorne Argument, anſwered and reiected long ſince by S. Auguſtine, who expoundeth this place thus, (5) *It is to be held without doubting, whatſoeuer that ſanctification was, it was not of power to make Chriſtians, and to remit ſinnes, vnles they were made faithfull by Eccleſiaſticall Inſtitution and Sacramentes: neither hils*

(4) *1. Cor. 7. 14.*

(5) *L. 3. de pec. merit. & remiſſ. c. 12.*

ones,

ones, how iuſt or holy ſoeuer their Parents were, of whom they were borne, can be abſolued from the guilt of Originall ſinne, vnles they ſhall be baptized in Chriſt &c. Wherupon it commeth to paſſe, that none can be regenerated in their parents not being borne, but if he ſhall be borne, it is meet he be regenerated, becauſe vnles one be borne againe, he cannot ſee the kingdome of God. And M. Bilſon alſo conforme to S. Auguſtine, repeating the forſaid text of 1. Cor. 7. 14. ther-vpon writeth thus, (6) *This is ſpoken not of the ſecret election of the faithfull, which is neither common to all, nor knowne to any but of their Chriſtian Profeſſion.* And a litle after ſayth, *If then Infantes be partakers of the ſame vocation and holines with their Parentes, & without Baptiſme &c. neither we nor our Children can be holy: ſurely the Children of Saintes, if they be excluded from Baptiſme, are as vnholy and vncleane, as the Children of Infidels.* The like anſwere is giuen by Marbachius, ſaying, (7) *It doth nothing helpe them, that which they diſpute from the place of Paul, that the Children of Chriſtians do take ſanctification from their Parentes &c. For the word Sanctity in that place, doth not ſignify ſpirituall ſanctity, wherof the Controuerſy is, but legall, or ciuill.* The true ſenſe of the place obiected then is, that wheras Children are ſaid to be holy, the meaning is, (8) that they are borne lawfull, and not baſe, which ſome might well haue doubted of, by reaſon of diſparity of Religion in their Parents, or elſe becauſe they were (9) conſecrated to God by the faithfull parent, being baptized and brought vp in the feare of God; which they had not bene, if the Infidell had departed from the faithfull, for then the Children would haue followed the Infidell Parent.

A third Obiection is, If Baptiſme were ſo neceſſary to Saluation that none could be ſaued without it, then many Children ſhould periſh without their fault, which ſeemeth neither to ſtand with Gods Iuſtice, or Mercy. I anſwere, the (10) Iudgments of God are iuſt, true, and righteous, yet ſecret, inſcrutable, and a bottomles depth: when he permitteth many Children to periſh, euen then are his Iudgements moſt iuſt, for though it is without their fault, that they are not baptized, yet without their fault they do not periſh ſeeing, being tainted, and

(6) In his true difference betwixt Chriſtian ſubiection &c. part. 4. p. 168.

(7) *Diſp. Theol. de Baptiſmatis Sacramento, ſect. 111, 112.*

(8) *Ambr. S. Thom. & Anſelmus in hunc locum.*

(9) *Tertul. l. 2. ad vxor. Hieron. l. 1. in Ioum. & in Ep. 151. ad Paulin. l. 11. Aug. l. 2. de pec. mer. & remiſſ. c. 26. & l. 3. c. 12. et l. 1 de ſerm. Dom. in mõte c. 27.*

(10) *Aug. l. 2. de bono perſeuerantiæ, c. 12. Proſper l. 2. de vocat. Gentium c. 8.*

found guilty of Originall ſinne, they iuſtly periſh.

Fourthly it is vrged, that Baptiſme is to vs, as Circumciſion was to the Iewes; but it is not likely, that all ſuch as dyed before the eight day vncircumciſed, periſhed, therfore Baptiſme is not ſo neceſſary vnto ſaluation, as that all periſh without it. Anſwere. The whole Argument ſtandeth vpon vncertainties, for (11) many hould that Circumciſion was not ordained, as a remedy againſt ſinne, neither do we know whether the Infantes of the Iewes had any other remedy, or what it was. And laſtly it it not a like reaſon of Chriſtians & them, for now there is a certaine Remedy determined by Chriſt, which is moſt common and eaſy, what then it was, we certainly know not, ſeeing the Scripture ſayth nothing.

Laſtly it is obiected, and further excepted, that according to our Catholicke Doctrine many are ſaued without Baptiſme, namely ſuch as haue the vow, wiſh, and deſire of Baptiſme, which could not be, if Baptiſme were ſo abſolutely neceſſary to ſaluation, as Catholickes teach. Anſwere. This Exception of ſuch ſo dying with a vow, or deſire of Baptiſme, is grounded vpon Scriptures, as where it is ſaid, (12) *If the impious ſhall do pennance from all ſinnes &c. liuing, he ſhall liue, and not dye.* And the reaſon which Deuines giue for this is, *Voluntas reputatur pro facto, The parties effectuall deſire of Baptiſme, when in ſtraites of time it cannot be had, ſupplyeth the place of Baptiſme:* as alſo the like deſire ſupplieth the performance of all other like Commandementes, though otherwiſe neuer ſo neceſſary. And this Exception is alſo warranted by the holy (13) Fathers. But the former Exception is impertinent, and cannot be applied to the Caſe of Infantes, becauſe all ſuch Effectuall deſire in them to haue Baptiſme, is wanting, and the forſaid holy Fathers do therfore iuſtly vpon warrant of Scripture, for want of Baptiſme, togeather with the deſire therof, which Infantes cannot haue, exclude them from heauen: Excepting alwayes the Caſe of *Martyrdome*, by which Infantes are ſaued, (14) though not baptized: for ſo S. Cyprian affirmeth, (15) *Martyrdome to be a Baptiſme*, and more

(11) *Philo l. de Circumciſione. Ioſephus l. 1. Antiquit. c. 12. Iuſtin. Martyr Dialogo cum Tryphone Iudæo. aut med. Iren. l. 4. c. 30. & c. 28. 29. 32. 34. Epiph hær. 8. Chryſoſt. ho. 27. in Gen. Tertul. l. cont. Iudæos. c. 1. Cypr. l. 1. cont. Iud. c. 8. & l. 3. Ep. 8. Ambroſ. Ep. 72. Hieron in c. 3. ad Gal. Aug. in pſ. 73.*

(12) *Ezech. 18. 21.*

(13) *Ambr. in Orat. de obitu Valentiniani Iunioris. Aug. l. 4. de Bap. c. 22. Bern. Ep 77.*

(14) See *Mat. 2. 16. Mat. 10. 39. Mar. 8. 35. Aug. de Ciu. Dei l. 13. c. 7.*

(15) *Præfat.*

more excellent then *Baptiſme of water*. (16) S. Ambroſe diſtinguiſheth three Baptiſmes, one of *water*, another of *blood*, and another of *Purgatory* in another life. And (17) many other Fathers do diſtinguiſh the Baptiſme of water, from the Baptiſme of Martyrdome.

(16) *lib. de Exhort. Martirij.*
(17) *In pſ. 118. ſerm. 3. Hier. in Orat. in ſancta Lumina.*

c. 4. *ad Eph.* *Aug. l. 3. de Civ. Dei. c. 7. Cyril. Catech. 3. Nazianz.*

CHAP. XXI.

The true ſtate of the Queſtion, concerning the B. Sacrament of Chriſtes Body, and Bloud.

Whether in the moſt holy Sacrament of the Euchariſt, vnder the formes of Bread and wine, there be truly, and really, and not only in ſigne, figure, or repreſentation, contayned the very Body and Bloud of Chriſt our Sauiour, which was borne of the B. Virgin Mary, and afterwards crucifyed.

SECT. I.

Catholike Doctrine.

WHEREAS Proteſtants pretend to belieue two Sacraments, Baptiſme & the Lords Supper; in the precedent Chapter I haue ſhewed how little eſteeme they haue of Baptiſme, as thinking it not neceſſary to remiſſion of ſinnes or ſalnation, and that it may be omitted, or taken away: I intend in this to ſhew their lyke, and farre greater contempt of the moſt diuine and heauenly Sacrament of the Euchariſt, making it in ſubſtance to be nothing

nothing elſe but bread and wine, and only in figure, ſigne, and repreſentation the Body and Bloud of Chriſt. But in Condemnation of this Hereſy, the Catholike Church (1) teacheth, and doth openly and ſimply profeſſe, that in the ſacred holy Sacrament of the Euchariſt, after the Conſecration of Bread and wyne, Our Lord Ieſus-Chriſt, true God and Man, is truly, really, and ſubſtantially vnder the forme of theſe ſenſile things contayned: for neyther are theſe things repugnant amongſt theſelues, that our Sauiour himſelfe may alwayes ſit at the right hand of his Father in heauen, according to the naturall manner of being, and that notwithſtanding, his ſubſtance may be preſent with vs, in many other places Sacramentally, in that manner of being, which although we can ſcarcely expreſſe with wordes, yet by our thoughts illuminated by fayth, we may apprehend it poſsible to God, and conſtantly we ought to beleeue it: for ſo all our Elders, ſo many as were in the true Church of Chriſt, who haue diſputed of this holy Sacrament, haue moſt openly profeſſed, that our Redeemer hath inſtituted this moſt admirable Sacrament in his laſt Supper, when after the Benediction of Bread and Wyne, he witneſſed in euident and plaine wordes, that he did giue them his owne very Body and Bloud: which wordes rehearſed by the holy Euangeliſtes, and afterwardes repeated by S. Paul, ſeeing they beare that proper and moſt plaine ſignification, according to which they were vnderſtood of the Fathers, it is verily a moſt haynous wickednes, that thoſe wordes ſhould be wreſted by certaine contentious and naughty men, to faigned and Imaginary tropes, wherby the truth of the flesh and Bloud of Chriſt is denied, againſt the vniuerſall ſenſe of the Church, which as a Pillar and foundation of truth, hath deteſted theſe falſe fictions, as Sathanicall, deuiſed by wicked men, acknowledging euer with a grateſull and myndfull hart, this moſt excellent benefit of Chriſt.

(1) Council. Trid. Seſſ. 13. c. 1.

And therefore, (2) If any ſhall deny, that the Body and the Bloud, togeather with the ſoule and Diuinity of our Lord Ieſus Chriſt, and therfore whole Chriſt, to be really and ſubſtantially contayned in the Sacrament of the moſt holy Euchariſte, but ſhall ſay, that he is only in it, as in a ſigne, or figure, or virtually, Anathema. (3) And, If any ſhall affirme in the holy Sacrament of the Euchariſt, the ſubſtance of bread and wine to remayne togeather with the Body and Bloud of our Lord Ieſus-Chriſt: and ſhall deny that admirable and ſingular Conuerſion of the whole ſubſtance of Bread into the Body, and whole ſubſtance

(2) Can. 1.

(3) Can. 2.

ſubſtance of wine into the Bloud, the formes of Bread and wine onely remayning, which conuerſion the Catholike Church doth moſt fitly call

(4) Can. 4. *Tranſubſtantiation, Anathema.* (4) *If any ſhall affirme, that Conſecration being made, there is not the Body and Bloud of our Lord Ieſus Chriſt in the admirable Sacrament of the Euchariſt, but onely in the vſe, whileſt it is receyued, but not before or after: And that in the Hoſtes or particles conſecrated, which are reſerued, or remayne after Communion, not to remayne the true Body of our Lord, Anathema.*

(5) Can. 6. *And.* (5) *If any ſhall affirme, that in the holy Sacrament of the Euchariſt, Chriſt the only begotten ſonne of God, is not to be adored with*

(6) Can. 8. *the worſhip of Latria* (or diuine) *euen externall &c. Anathema.* (6) *Or that Chriſt exhibited in the Euchariſt, is only eaten ſpiritually, &*

(7) Can. 9. *not alſo Sacramentally and really, let him be accurſed.* (7) *If any ſhal deny, that all and euery Chriſtian of eyther ſexe, when they ſhall come to the yeares of Diſcretion, to be bound yearely, at leaſt at Eaſter to*

(8) Can. 11. *comunicate, according to the Precept of our holy Mother the Church, Anathema.* (8) *And if any ſhall ſay, Only fayth to be preparation ſufficient to receiue the Sacrament of the moſt holy Euchariſt, Anathema. And leaſt ſo great a Sacrament ſhould be receiued vnworthily, and ſo to death, and condemnation, the holy Synod doth ordayne and declare,*

(9) Conc. Nicen. 1. l. 3. Decret. de diuina Menſa. *that Sacramentall Confeſſion is neceſſary to be firſt vſed by them if they haue meanes of a Ghoſtly Father, whome the Conſcience of Mortall ſinnes doth burden, although they thinke themſelues neuer ſo contrite.* So cleerly and particularly is our Catholike Doctrine declared, and Decreed by this ſacred Synod.

(10) Apud Iac. Andræam, in Confut. Diſp. Grinæi, de cœna Domini. p. 88. Oecolamp. l. Epiſt. Oecol. & Zwingl. p. 663. 667. Bilſ. true differ. part. 4. pag. 551.

In the firſt and moſt famous Councell of Nice, it is thus determined, (9) *Let vs not be a litle attent to the Bread & Cup propoſed on the diuine Table, but eleuating our mindes by faith, let vs vnderſtand that Lambe of God which taketh away the ſinnes of the world, to be placed vpon that ſacred Table, to be ſacrificed by Prieſtes vnbloudily, and that we receyuing his precious Body and Bloud, to beliewe theſe to be the ſignes of our Reſurrection.* This Canon is acknowledged for true, by the Prot. writers, (10) Grinæus, Oecolampadius, & D. Bilſon.

(11) Act. 6. Tom. 3. eiuſdem fine.

In the ſecond Councell of Nice, it is ſayd (11) of Chriſt our Sauiour, that *hauing taken Bread giuing thankes, he brake, and gaue to his Diſciples, and ſaid, Take yee, and eat yee, This is my body &c. And he ſaid not, take yee, and eate yee the Image of my*

Bod)

Body &c. Our Lord, or his Apoſtles, or Fathers, haue in no place called an Image (or figure) the vnbloudy Sacrifice, which is offered by the Prieſt, but the very Body it ſelfe, and the Bloud it ſelfe &c. Before they are ſanctifyed they are called types, but after Sanctification, they are called, are, and beleiued, properly the Body and Bloud of Chriſt.

In the Councell of Laterane it is defined that, (12) *There is one vniuerſall Church of the faythfull, out of which none at all is ſaued: In which Chriſt Ieſus is both the Prieſt, and the Sacrifice, whoſe Body and Bloud in the Sacrament of the Aultar, are truly contayned vnder the formes of Bread and wine; the Bread by diuine power tranſubſtantiated into the Body, and the wine into the Bloud, that for the perfecting the Myſtery of Vnity, we might receiue of his, what he hath receyued of ours. No man can make this Sacrament, but a Prieſt, who is duly ordered according to the keyes of the Church, which Chriſt Ieſus granted to the Apoſtles, and to their Succeſſours.* And the like is taught by the other Generall Councels of (13) Conſtance, and (14) Florence.

Anſwerably to theſe holy Councells, all (15) Catholikes now beleiue, that in this bleſſed Sacrament, the Body and Bloud of Chriſt are not only figuratiuely, ſpiritually, or by fayth, but truly and really, the Subſtance of Bread & wine being wholly changed or tranſubſtantiated into that very Body and Bloud of our Lord, which he tooke from the euer B. Virgin Mary, and which was afterwards offered vpon the Croſſe.

(11) *Conc. Lateran. 4. Oecum. Sub. Innoc. 3. Cap. 1.*
(13) *Seſſ. 13.*
(14) *Decret. Eugen. PP.*
(15) *Bellar. de Euchar. l. 1. c. 2. & c. & l. 3. c. 18. &c. Rhem. Teſt. in Mat. 26. 26. & in Luc. 22. 19.*
(12) *Scotus in 4. Diſt. 12. q. 1.*
(17) *Caietanus.*
(18) *Paludan. 4. Diſt 12. q. 3. Capreol. eadem Diſt q. 1. Concil. a. Pet. à Soto in Inſtit. Sacerd. lect. 2. de Euchar.*
(19) *Alex. Halen. 4 pt q. 13. mem. 4. art. 3. Bonau. in 4. Diſt. Art. 1. q. 2. Alanus de Euchar. c. 19.*

Pointes Diſputable.

All teaching, that the Accidents of Bread and Wine remayne without ſubiect: yet concerning the manner, (16) Some thinke, that nothing of new is added vnto them, but that God only doth preſerue them without ſubiect. (17) Others, that God giueth them a certayne ſubſtantiall manner of being, by vertue whereof they ſubſiſt by themſelues.

Some (18) thinke, that the forme conſiſteth in all thoſe wordes (*enim* excepted) which according to the rite of the Latin Church, are pronounced at Conſecration. But (19) others more truly teach, that the wordes *Nouí*, and *Eterni*, and

the reſt that follow, are not of the Eſſence of the forme.

Some (20) teach that, Tranſubſtantiation is made by Production; Others by adduction; Others by Conſeruation: but none of theſe are determined by any Councell.

(20) See Bellar. de Euchar l. 3. cap. 18. and D. Morton in his Maſſe of Chriſt. l. 3 c. 3. Sect 1.

Proteſtant Vntruthes.

Luther (21) affirmeth, that S. Thomas was Authour of that opinion which all Catholikes teach, to wit, that in the Sacrament of the Aultar, there is not the ſubſtance of Bread and Wine, but only accidents. But to omit more Ancient teſtimonies, this Doctrine was defyned in the Councell of (22) Lateran, before S. Thomas was borne.

(21) L. de Captiuit. Babyl. c. 1. quod eſt de Euchar.

(22) C. 1.

Caluin (23) teacheth, that Pope Alexander was the firſt that vſed *vnleauened bread*: but is cleere that (24) Chriſt vſed it before vpon the firſt day of the Azimes.

(23) Inſtit. l. 4. c 17. §. 41.

(24) Mat. 26. Mar. 14. Luc. 22.

Luther (25) and others auouch, that *Tranſubſtantiation* was firſt inuented by the Councell of Laterane. But to omit all other proofes; the Centuriſtes affirme, that S. *Chryſoſtome* (26) *ſeemeth to teach Tranſubſtantiation*: and that, *Euſebius Emiſſenus* (27) *did ſpeake vnprofitably of Tranſubſtantiation*: & that S. Ambroſe (28) *did not write well of Tranſubſtantiation*. Vrſinus confeſſeth, that, (29) *In Cyprian are many ſayings which ſeeme to affirme Tranſubſtantiation*. And Adamus Franciſci, will not deny, but that (30) *Tranſubſtantiation entred early into the Church*.

(25) L. de Captiuit. Babyl. c. 1. Pet. Mart. l. 1. cont. Gardin. obiect. 128. Calu. Inſtit. l. 4. c. 17. §. 25.

(26) Cent. 5. Col. 517.

(27) Cent. 4. c. 10. Col. 985. 895.

(28) Cent. 4. c. 4 col. 295.

(29) Commonefactio cuiuſdam Theol. de S. Cœna &c. p. 211. 218.

(30) Margarita Theol. pa. 256.

Peter Martyr and Chemnitius report, that the Grecians do reiect Tranſubſtantiation: but this is proued cleerely falſe, by the (31) Cenſure of the Grecians, giuen vpon the Confeſſion of Auguſta.

(31) Cenſura Orientalium ad Auguſt. confeſſ. c. 10.

Chemnitius accuſeth Andradius to teach, that Tranſubſtantiation is one of thoſe points which cannot be proued from Scriptures: but he corrupteth him, his words are theſe: (32) *Although Tranſubſtantiation could not be proued by manifeſt Scriptures, as you thinke &c.* But Chemnitius to ſerue his own purpoſe, can eaſily change a Conditionall ſpeach into an abſolute.

(32) Lib. de cœna Dom.

Prote-

Proteſtant Doctrine.

The Engliſh Prot. Church decreeth, that, (33) *Tranſubſtantiation, or the change of the ſubſtance of Bread and wine in the ſupper of the Lord, cannot be proued by holy writ: but it is repugnant to the plaine words of Scripture, ouerthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, & hath giuen occaſion to many Superſtitions. The body of Chriſt is giuen, taken, and eaten in the ſupper only after an heauenly and ſpirituall manner. And the meane whereby the Body of Chriſt is receaued and eaten in the ſupper, is fayth. The Sacrament of the Lords Supper, was not by Chriſts ordinance reſerued, carryed about, lifted vp, or worshipped.*

(33) Article 28.

Zwinglius teacheth that, (34) *Bread is only a figure whereby that Body is ſignifyed, whereof we ought to be myndfull.* (35) *The drinke was indeed nothing elſe then wyne.* Cartwright, (36) *The Euchariſt is only a ſigne.* Perkins (37) *Bread is called the body, when as it is only a ſigne or ſeale of the Body.*

(34) *Tom. 2. de cœna fol. 289.* (35) *Ibid. fol. 291.* (36) *Apud Martyr. in diſp. Oxon. p. 134.* (37) *Tom. de cœna. Col. 858.*

All know that Luther and his followers do beleiue the *Reall Preſence*, but their Error was, that with the Body and the Bloud, there was alſo Bread and Wine in the Sacrament.

Caluin condemneth in this both Luther and Zwinglius, and inuenteth another way of his owne, which I ſhall examine and confute, in the next Section at large.

Proteſtants agree with Ancient Hereticks.

The firſt *Hereticks* (as S. Auſtin (38) termeth them) that impugned the *Reall Preſence*, were the *Capharnaites*, ſaying, (39) *How can this man giue vs his flesh to eate?* But they were reproued by Chriſt himſelfe in theſe wordes (40) *Amen, Amen I ſay vnto you, vnles you eate the flesh &c.* And wheras not only the *Capharnaites*, but ſome of Chriſt his Diſciples doubted alſo herof, as appeareth by theſe wordes, (42) *Many therfore of his Diſciples hearing it ſaid, This ſaying is hard, and who can heare it?* Theſe alſo are reprehended by Chriſt (43) for *murmuring* and Incredulity. Now, that Iudas was one of theſe Diſci-

(38) *In pſal. 54.* (39) *Io. 6. 52.* (40) *Io. 6. 53.* (42) *Io. 6. 60.* (43) Io. 6. 61. 64.

ples who did not beliue the Reall Preſence, S. Chriſoſtome (45) gathereth out of theſe words: (46) *But there be certaine of you that beliue not: for Ieſus knew from the beginning who they were that did not beliue, and who he was that would betray him:* and S. Auſtin affirmeth, (47) *Iudas to haue ſtayed then with Chriſt, not to vnderſtand and beliue, but to deceiue.* Yea S. Auſtine (48) affirmeth *Iudas* to haue bene the chiefeſt ſuborner and maintainer of this hereſy, and that this was the firſt Hereſy againſt Chriſtes doctrine: and he commendeth Peter for his humble obedience, infirmely beliuing Chriſtes wordes to be true, which he did not yet vnderſtand. So that as the Iewes vſed *Iudas* for their Captaine & chiefe helper in the betraying and apprehending of Chriſt; ſo the Sacramentaries vſe the ſame *Iudas*, as their ringleader and Maiſter for their taking Chriſt from the Sacrament, and Aultar. And as *Iudas* was tempted by the Deuill to betray Chriſt, *for* (49) *Satan entred into Iudas* &c. ſo alſo by the Deuill was he made a Sacramentary: for as I haue ſhewed before, that he was one of thoſe Diſciples that did not beliue the Reall Preſence, for which he was reproued by Chriſt, ſo preſently after this Chriſt ſayth of him (50) *Haue not I choſen you the 12. and of you one is a Deuill?* So that the firſt Impugner of the Reall Preſence, was the Deuill, after him the Capharnaits & Iudas, frō whom our moderne Prot. are lineally deſcended: and ſo I may ſay of them, (51) *You are of your Father the Deuill, and the deſires of your Father you will do.*

But this their Pedigree is ſo certaine, that Luther (52) auoucheth Martin Bucer to haue bene taught by a Malignant Spirit to deny the Body and Bloud of Chriſt to be truly and really in the Euchariſt. Zwinglius confeſſeth of himſelfe, that he had, (53) *An admoniſher black or white, he remembreth not*; who taught him by Scriptures to make the Euchariſt only a figure: but Schluſſelburg determineth, that it (54) was *the blacke ſpirit of darkneſs, from whom the Zwinglians tooke this their Sacramentary opinion.* And diuers (55) authors do record of Berengarius, that he being in the Chamber of Biſhop Fulbertus, formerly his Maiſter, who was at the point of death, the

(43) Ho. 46. in Ioan.
(44) Io 6. 64.
(47) Tract. 27. in Ioan.
(48) In Enar Pſ. 54. aduer. 22. & pſ. 55. aduer. 7.
(49) Luc. 22. 3.
(50) Io. 6. 70.
(51) Io. 8. 44.
(52) In Colloquio Wittemberg.
(53) L. de ſubſidio Euchariſtiæ.
(54) Theol. Calum. l. 2. fol. 76.
(55) Baronius Anno 1108. Nicolaus Serrarius in opuſculo de Bt. Calixt.

the Bishop commanded, that he should be cast out of the chamber, because he saw the Deuill vpon his shoulder, beckoning with his hand to others to follow him, and therby foresaw (56) that by the Instigation of the Deuill, he would proue a great deprauer of Catholicke doctrine. S. Cyrill (57) of Alexandria gathereth from S. Paul, (58) that some of the *Corinthians* did not belieue this mystery: for the Apostle against this their Error, with great vehemency of wordes repeateth the Institution of Christ: *You meeting* (sayth he) *together, I heare there are diuisions amongst you, and in part I believe, for there must be Heresies &c. for seeing* (sayth S. Cyrill) *some of them did not know the Tradition and force of the Mistery, they made in the Churches dainty bankets, and pleasing suppers.* So that, they had not the Celebration of that mistery, for a thing so sacred as the Body and Bloud of Christ, but almost for a vulgar, or peraduenture mysticall supper, in regard of some signification: which Error, with some other Abuses that the Apostle might confute, he repeateth the Institution euen as he *had receyued it from our Lord &c.* And he inferreth, that they did *receiue vnworthily, because they did not discerne the Body of our Lord*, as not being so in their opinion. S. Austine writing of this point, affirmeth, that (59) *The Apostle sayth, therfore they receiued vnworthily, who did not discerne this from other meates (veneratione singulariter debita) with honour singularly due: for forthwith when he had said, He eateth and drinketh Iudgment to himselfe, he annexed, that he might say, not discerning the Body of our Lord: which sufficiently appeareth in all that place of the first Epistle to the Corinthians, if it be diligently marked.* Here S. Austine insinuateth (as also S. Cyrill did obserue) that to this belongeth that which the Apostle said in the precedent Chapter; *The Bread which we breake, is it not the Communication of the Body of Christ? and the Cup of Benediction which we blesse, is it not the Communication of the Bloud of Christ?* as though some there were amongst the Corinthians which did deny this, although there were others that did belieue it.

(56) *Guliel. Malmesburiensis l. 3. de Rebus gestis Anglorum. l. 4.*
(57) *Pentab. apud Turrianum. l. 1. de Can. Apost. c. 22.*
(58) *1. Cor. 10. & 11.*
(59) *Ep. 118. c. 3.*

And though some vnderstand this place not of heresy, or Error in Doctrine, but of Error in Manners, in that some of the Corinthians did banket in the Church, and did not

admit the poore to the holy Communion: yet in that it is ſaid heerof that, *There muſt be Hereſies*, which ſundry Ancient (60) Fathers do expound of hereſies in Doctrine, I do not ſee but it muſt be vnderſtood both of hereſies in doctrine, & abuſes in Manners. The Sacramentaries then haue for their Ancient Patrones, certaine of the Corinthians, but they haue alſo S. Paul reprouing and condemning them.

The Saturnians did not belieue the Diuine Word to haue taken vnto him mans body, but only a certaine figure or Image therof; wherupon they thought conſequently, that in the Euchariſt there was only a figure of a mans body; S. Ignatius ſayth of them, (61) *They do not admit Euchariſtes and Oblations, becauſe they do not confeſſe the Euchariſt to be the fleſh of our Sauiour Ieſus Chriſt, which fleſh ſuffered for our ſinnes.* Theſe words are acknowledged and cyted for the words of Saint Ignatius, by (62) Chemnitius, Hamelmanus, Simon Pauli, and other Proteſtants.

To omit many others, for the ſame Errour was condemned *Berengarius* by the Councell of Vercelles, vnder Leo the nynth. And after by the Councell of Tours, vnder Victor the ſecõd: where being preſent, he promiſed by Oath neuer to defend that Hereſy agayne. But afterwards falling into a relapſe, a generall Councell was aſſembled at Rome, by Nicolas the ſecond, in which he was agayne (63) condemned, and himſelfe, in the preſence of the Pope and the whole Councell, burned his owne Bookes, and renewed his Oath, and (64) forme of faith which he had formerly made. But for all this he relapſed agayne, and thereupon was called to a (65) Councell aſſembled at Rome vnder Gregory the 7. where he was agayne condemned: and there, it is ſaid, he ſeriouſly repented, & afterwards dyed well and piouſly.

The *Antropomorphites* denyed the Euchariſts reſeruation, but they were condemned by S. (66) Cyrill, as is alſo confeſſed and diſliked by Pet. (67) Martyr and other Proteſtãts. From theſe condemned Heretickes our Moderne Sectaries haue learned to deny the Reall Preſence of Chriſtes Body and Bloud in the Bleſſed Sacrament of the Aultar.

(60) *Cyprian l. de vnit. Eccl. & l. 3. ad Quirinum. c. 93. Auguſt. de Ciuit. Dei. l. 16. c. 2. & l. 1. de Gen. cont. Manich c. 2. & in Pſ. 67.*

(61) *Ep ad Smyrn ap. Theodoret. Dial. 3.* And ſee Iren. *l 5. cap. 2.*

(62) *Exam. part. 2. p. 94. Hamelman. de Tradit. Apoſt. Col. 746. Simon Method. aliquot. loc part. 3. fol. 172.*

(63) *Decret. de Conſecrat. Diſt. 2 Can. Ego Berengarius.*

(64) See *Thom. Waldenſ. tom. 2. de Sacram. c. 41.*

(65) *Guliel. Malmesb. de geſtis Angl. l. 3.*

(66) *Ad Coloſſyrium.*

(67) Cont. Gardin. col. 838. Fulk againſt Heskins p. 83. Oecolamp. l. 3. Ep. 88.

Prott.

Proteſtants Errours.

Beza broacheth this ſtrange Doctrine, (68) *Where bread or wine are either not vſed, or not great plenty thereof at ſomtymes, muſt no ſupper of the Lord be celebated? Yea it wilbe daly celebrated, if that which either by common vſe, or, by reaſon of the tyme, ſupplyeth the place of Bread and Wine, be vſed inſteed of Bread and wine.* So that a Pye-cruſt, and a bowle of Beere or milke, wilbe matter ſufficient for a Proteſtant Communion. And in further proofe of this his Errour, he produceth (69) at large the ſame Doctrine of Caluin, and other Proteſtants.

(68) *Epiſt. Theol. 2. Tho. Tilio circa med.*

(69) *Ep. 25. Tilenus in ſynag. c. 61. p. 719. Bucanus Inſtit. Theol. loc. 48. p. 663. Hunnius Diſp. 47. p. 282.*

Luther ſpeaking of the Preparation to be made before receyuing, ſayth, (70) *The beſt diſpoſition is none but that wherewith thou art worſt diſpoſed: and on the contrary, then thou art worſt diſpoſed, when thou art beſt diſpoſed.* And heerupon he perſuadeth not to repent before Communion, but after. And (71) thinketh that man moſt fit for Communion, who is fallen into ſowleſt crimes. *I will* (72) (ſaith he) *ſpeake rashly and freely, There are not any neerer to God in this lyfe, nor more gratefull & louing ſonnes, then theſe haters and blaſphemers of God.* Yea he iudgeth that (73) *only thoſe may receyue worthily, who haue ſorrowfull, afflicted, troubled, confounded, and erroneous Conſciences.* And in the ſame place he contradicteth himſelfe, for he affirmeth that, *only ſayth is the peace of Conſcience, only Infidelity the trouble of Conſcience.* And yet he exhorteth Chriſtians to come to receiue with vndoubted fayth. But if they only receyue worthily who haue troubled Conſciences, & only Infidelity is the trouble of the Conſcience, then they only receaue worthily who want fayth, for thoſe that haue fayth, haue peace, not trouble of Conſcienee, and therefore according to him, it is vnlawfull to exhort Communicants to come with fayth. He (74) further teacheth, that none ought to be admitted to Communion, but thoſe who acknowledge they come, becauſe they are troubled with the Conſcience of mortall ſinne, whereby he excommunicateth the B. Virgin, and all the Apoſtles after their receiuing of the holy Ghoſt

(70) *In Concione de digna Præparatione ad Sacram. Euch.*

(71) *In Concione de Confeſſione & Euchar.*

(72) *Tom. 2. in pſal. 5 fol. 172.*

(73) *De Captiuit. Babyl. c. de Euchar.*

(74) *In Tra. de Communione populi.*

Ghoſt, for doubtles they could not ſay, that they were troubled with the Conſcience of mortall ſinne.

Concerning Gods Omnipotency, a Proteſtant writeth thus, (75) *Calvin in ſundry places sharply refuteth the fiction of Gods abſolute power, which the Sophiſters do publish in their ſchooles.* And yet others of his Brethren teach, that ſo potent is Fayth, that (67) *it can make things future, abſent, and moſt remote, to be preſent.* Whereupon Andreas interreth very well, that, (77) *they attribute more power to fayth, then to Chriſt.*

Some Prot. thinke the reall Preſence to be impoſſible: for Beza writeth, that, God (78) *cannot make that the Body of Chriſt at one, and the ſame tyme eſſentially be preſent in many places.* Sadeel ſayth, (79) *We have ſhewed, that the Body of Chriſt cannot indeed be preſent in many places at the ſame tyme, and that the Omnipotency of God cannot do this.* The like is taught by ſundry Prot. (80) concerning Chriſt his Body penetrating the doores, the ſtone of the Sepulcher &c. and his body not occupying place.

Zwinglius profeſſeth his damnable Infidelity concerning the B. Sacrament, in theſe words: (81) *Although God with all his Bleſſed Angells ſhould deſcend from heaven, and ſhould ſweare, in the ſupper of the Lord the Body and Bloud of Chriſt to be giuen to all that receiue it; yet I neyther could, nor would believe it, vnles with my eyes and hands I ſhould ſee and feele Chriſt preſent.* So that according to this accurſed Hereticke, we muſt in this Sacred Myſtery, rather believe our eyes, and hands (being but fallible ſenſes) then the Oathes of God, and all his bleſſed Angels, being of Infallible verity: what argument then can be expected to be ſo powerfull, as to withdraw an hereticke from his obſtinate blindnes?

(75) *Reſp. ad calum. Nebulonis. p. 730.*
(76) *Sadeel. de Sacram. manduc. p. 300. Whitak. l. 2. Cont. Dur. ſect. 8.*
(77) *Apud Schluſſ. l. 4. Theol. Calu. art. 9. p. 344.*
(78) *In Colloq. Montisb. p. 27.*
(79) *Reſp. ad Art. 14. abbrev. p. 433. 434.*
(80) *Tilenus in ſynt. 2. p. 75. Beza l. quæſt. vol. 2. p. 858. Damanus apud Andr. in Colloq. Montisbel. p. 270.*
(81) *Apud Schluſſelb. l. 4 Theol. Calvin 263.*

art. 9. p. 344. And ſee the like in Reſp. ad Billicanum, Tom. 2. fol.

SECT.

SECT. II.

Wherein is enquired what Protestants understand by receiuing spiritually, or by fayth.

I Desire to premonish the Reader of the strange proceedings, shamefull contrarieties, & desperate shiftes which Prot. vse in their disputes with vs, in this weightiest Controuersy of the B. Sacrament. The Question of the Reall Presence being but propounded, they presently tell vs, that Christ never intended or willed it. And when to declare his will, we alledge his word, they make then new question of his power, vnder pretence, that it is impossible. And when in reply thereto, we proue to them directly and confessedly that it is not impossible, then returning by a Circle to their former Euasion, they answere, that the Question is not of his power, but only of his will. And whē we vrge the wordes of Christ himselfe, their answers sometymes are, that the wordes are plaine for Transubstantiation: but at other tymes they maintaine, that they are full of figures and obscurities. The figure they will sometymes haue in the Pronowne, *This*; but this being by vs cleered, then they remoue it to the verbe. *Is*: and when this also is conuinced of falshood, then they fly to the Substantiue *Body*: and when this will not serue their turne, then they looke out figures in the *Cup*, in the *Bloud*, and in the *Testament*: but these being cleerely discouered to be false or impertinent, they finally charge the Euangelist S. Luke with Solecisme, incōgruity, and error in the Text. That these and sundry other such lyke Rounds the dance, and betake themselues to such base and vnworthy shiftes, I referre my selfe to this subsequent Discourse.

Protestants vnderstand by receiuing *spiritually* or by *Faith*, that they do receiue in their Communion, not only the Sacrament of Christs Body, neyther only the grace and spirituall effects of his Body, but besids all this, they affirme, that they

they do really and truly receiue the very Body and Bloud of Christ after a spirituall and wonderfull manner. To this end M. Whitaker sayth, (1) *whereas you do affirme that I do slip from the Body of Christ, to the force and benefit of his Body, it is very idle; as though I separated the force and benefit from the Body it selfe, or when I denyed that we excluded the Communion of his Body, I did not openly affirme the Body it selfe to be receyued.* The Confession of Belgia doth likewise teach, that, (2) *that which is eaten is the very naturall Body of Christ &c.* And, *that this Supper is the Spirituall Table, in which we are partakers as well of Christ himselfe, as of the merits of his death and Passion.* In like manner Amandus Polanus sayth, (3) *Not only Bread and wyne, neyther only the Deity, neyther only the vertue and efficacy of Christ is present in the Supper; but the very Body and the very Bloud of Christ, are in very deed presens in the Sacred Supper.* And the like presence as well of his Body, as of the efficacy thereof, is yet further plainely affirmed by sundry other Protestant (4) writers; in so much as D. Whitaker declaring what is in question betweene them and vs, sayth expressely, (5) *We make not question of the Presence of Christs Body, but only we dispute of the manner of his Presence, which you affirme to be Carnall and Capharnaitall; and we heauenly, spirituall, and diuine.* And howsoeuer Zwinglius, Oecolampadius, Peter (6) Martyr, and some (7) others stand aduerse to this Protestanticall Reall Presence of Christs Body, yet as M. Hooker confesseth, the former opinions of Zwinglius and Oecolampadius notwithstanding, (8) *All sides at length are growne to a generall agreement, concerning the Real participation of Christ*: whereupon he concludeth, that, (9) *the Eucharist is not a figure only, and that the efficacy of Christes Body & Bloud, is not all we receyue in this Sacrament*; affirming further, that *these mysteries do make vs partakers both of the Grace of that Body, and besides also do impart to vs, euen in true and reall, though mysticall maner, the very person of our Lord himself.* This may seem much to come from Protestants.

But yet they further confesse, that although they say, they receyue Christes Body *spiritually*, yet they say, they vse not the word (*Spirituall*) meaning thereby to exclude their former

(1) Whitak. cont. Durarum. l. 2. p. 189 circ. med

(2) See the Harm. of Confess p. 411.

(3) Syllog. Thesium de cœna Domini. p. 304. et. l. 1. part 11. Theol. p. 179.

(4) See Smith ser. 1. p. 103 & the French Confess in the Harm. p. 416. & Obseru. annexed thereto. sect. 14.

(5) Whitak. cont. Durœum. p. 159.

(6) In Ep. annexed to his com. places in Engl. Ep. 25. p. 107.

(7) Oecolamp. l. de verbis Domini. Hoc est corpus meum. Lauatarus Hist. Sacram. p. 4. Art. Serm. 3. de cœna.

(8) Hook. Eccl. Pol. l. 5. sect. 67. p. 174. (9) Ib. p. 177.

former real receyuing of Christs naturall Body: for the Deuines of Geneua do explayne the matter, (10) *Spiritualis perceptionis nomine &c. by the name of spirituall receiuing, we do not meane that, whereby is receiued the only spirituall Grace of Christ.* And the French Confession answerable to this sayth, (11) *We do vtterly deny, that instead of the very Body & Bloud of Christ, we do place only his merits, or his spirituall force and operation*, affirming further that they, *though spiritually and mystically, do yet notwithstanding truly participate Christ himselfe.* And heere Prot. giue a twofold reason for the vsing of the word, *spirituall*: first, for that their spirit or sayth, and not their bodily mouth receiueth Christs Body in the Sacrament. Secondly, for that according to M. Fulke, (12) *The Creatures or elements, being blessed and consecrated, are by the working of Gods spirit, changed into the Body and Bloud of Christ, after a Diuine and spirituall manner vnto the worthy receyuers, the cooperation of his Omnipotent power making it his Body and Bloud vnto vs.*

(10) *Vide Apol. modeſt. ad acta Conuentus 15. Theologorum Turgæ nuper habit. p. 49.*

(11) *Sect. 14.*

(12) In his Defence of the Engl. Translat. ag. Gregory Mart. p. 455.

Now for the manner of their Reall spirituall Presence of Christes Body, they explaine it in diuers of their Confessions, as fitst in that of France thus, (13) *We say it is done spiritually, not that we may counterfayt an Imagination &c. but rather because this mistery of our vnion with Christ is so high a thing, that it surmounteth all our senses, yea and the whole Order of nature; and because it being diuine and heauenly, cannot be perceiued, nor apprehended but by faith.* Secondly, the Confession of Belgia sayth, (14) *The manner is selfe being far aboue the reach of our Capacity, cannot be comprehended of any &c. Neither shall we erre in saying that, that which is eaten is the very naturall body of Christ &c. Furthermore this supper bringeth to passe, that we in it are partakers as well of himselfe, as of the merits of his death and Passion.*

(13) In Harm. Confeſſ. p. 416.

(14) In Harm. Confeſſ. p 431.

Thirdly, the Brethren of Geneua expresse the manner, by way of demand saying; (15) *But how can it be brought to passe, that we liuing vpon Earth, should participate the flesh of Christ now placed in Heauen, and though it be spiritually, yet it is truly and by fayth &c. This I say surmounteth our Capacity, and is that Mistery which the Apostle pronounceth to be Great.* Lastly Iohn Caluin concludeth for all, saying, (16) *Nothing remayneth but that I should burst out into admiration of that Mistery, to which neither my mind*

(15) In *Apol. modeſt. ad acta conuentus. p. 47. ante med.*

(16) *Inſt. l. 4. c. 17. ſect. 32.*

mind in thinking, nor tongue in ſpeaking can be equall. And the like is affirmed by diuers others.

But this Doctrine and manner of the Prot. Reall Preſence thus explicated, is chargeable with manifeſt and manifold Contradictions: as firſt, that Chriſtes naturall body ſhould be truly and really preſent, and yet not bodily but ſpiritually: if they vnderſtand, ſpiritually, as excluding the Reall ſubſtance and being of a thing corporal, this ſeemeth a manifeſt contradiction, for as the true ſubſtance of Chriſtes ſpirit cannot be corporally or bodily preſent to vs, becauſe it is no body but a ſpirit, ſo neither can Chriſtes body be preſent to vs ſpiritually, (except we vnderſtand the word ſpiritually as the (17) Apoſtle doth, which would be impertinent to the matter in hand) becauſe it is no ſpirit but a Body: and therfore whether the Proteſtants affirme Chriſtes Body to be truly preſent in, or with the Sacrament, or truly preſent to their faith, yet the true preſence therof, muſt needs be bodily, and not ſpiritually in the aboue mentioned ſenſe, vnles they will change his Body into a ſpirit.

(17) 1. Cor. 15. 44.

Secondly, what more contradictory, then Chriſtes body muſt be contained in heauen, only, and that vntill the day of Iudgment, and yet alſo the ſame Body is truly preſent to them vpon Earth? here alſo they are forced to fly to their imagined Euaſion, crying out, that this alſo is wonderfull & aboue all courſe of nature. Caluin ſayth hereof, (18) *Although it may ſeeme incredible, that in ſo great a diſtance of places as of heauen and Earth, the flesh of Chriſt ſhould penetrate to vs, that it may be meate for vs, we muſt yet remember, how much aboue all our ſenſe, the ſecret power of the holy Ghoſt can shew it ſelfe.* And after: (19) *If any man (ſaith he) aske me the manner herof, I ſhall not be aſhamed to confeſſe, that it is a ſecret more high then can be comprehended by wit, or declared by wordes.* With Caluin agreeth Beza, in like manner ſaying herof, (20) *Nowtheles we confeſſe the Miſtery of God to be incomprehenſible, wherby it commeth to paſſe, that that which is in heauen and no where elſe, ſhould be truly communicated to vs, who are now vpon Earth and no where eld.* And the Diuines of Geneua conclude, and ſay of this very point, (21) *that it ſurmounteth all vnderſtanding euen of the Angels themſelues, and ſheweth ſufficiently*

(18) *Inſtit. l. 4. c. 17. ſect. 30.*

(19) *Ib. Calu. ſect. 32.*

(20) *Dere Sacram.*

(21) *Apol. modeſt. ad acta conuent. p. 24. & 27. & ad med.*

ſciently that we do by this our doctrine, attribute more to the Omnipotency of Chriſt, then they who thinke the true Communicating of Chriſt to be abolished, vnles the Reall Preſence and receiving of Chriſtes Body with the mouth, be eſtabliſhed.

But now the Inſtrument or meanes of this great wonder D. Whitaker teacheth to be our (22) *Faith*, the ſame being *the ground of things* (23) *hoped for, and an argument of things not ſeene*: our *faith* therfore it is, and the holy Ghoſt, which as Caluin ſayth, doth (24) *vere vnire qua locis diſiunctæ ſunt, truly vnite together things which are ſeuered in places*: and which as Baſtingius teacheth, (25) *maketh things abſent to be preſent.*

Whence alſo it commeth to paſſe, that Chriſtes Body, though not then in being, was yet, according to their Doctrine, truly preſent to the Fathers of the Old Teſtament, & that not in efficacy only, but in very deed, and as truly as he is now preſent to them in the Sacrament. In ſo much that in reguard of the Fathers ſaid Reall eating of Chriſtes Body, before it was borne or in being (which manducation or eating is but an accident thereunto) they doubt not to defend, that, *non ens, may haue accidentia, nothing may haue accidents*: Yea D. Whitaker goeth ſo far in this kind of the Fathers eating Chriſtes true and Reall Body by faith, that he deſireth this Doctrine following for currant. (26) *But the Body of Chriſt was not yet borne or framed? that hindreth nothing whereby faith may not enioy the Body of Chriſt not yet created &c. For if Chriſt were ſlaine from the beginning of the world, then was he preſent to the Ancient Fathers by his Body and Death.* And in the ſame place following, he addeth, (27) *That all the Fathers did eate the ſame ſpirituall meate, and drinke the ſame ſpirituall drinke, to wit, Chriſt: but if they did eate and drinke Chriſte, it followeth, that Chriſt was preſent vnto them.* And to the like effect ſpeaketh Grinæus a Caluiniſt, in anſwering a Lutheran Opponent in a publick Diſputation, his wordes are theſe, (28) *Therfore there is a double erauing of the thing in queſtion: firſt, that in the Old Teſtament the Body of Chriſt was not at all preſent*, and elſwhere, Grinæus further anſwereth, ſaying, (29) *Now becauſe you do confeſſe, that the Fathers of the Old Teſtament, by a liuely faith were made partakers of the efficacy of the Body of Chriſt, you muſt alſo neceſſarily*

(22) *L. 2. cont. Durum. p. 170.*
(23) *Heb. 11. 1.*
(24) *Calu. Inſtit. l. 4. c. 17. ſect. 10.*
(25) *In Catechiſmo Augſtic. fol. 130.*
(26) *L. 2. cont. Dur. p. 170.*
(27) *Ib. p. 172.*
(28) *See Acta Diſp. de S. Cœna in Academ. Heidelburg. habit. Anno 1584. fol. 73.*
(29) *Ib. p. 744.*

confeſſe this thing further, that the ſame Fathers alſo were made partakers of the Body of Chriſt. And yet againe returning vpon the Opponent, he ſaith, (30) *Either you muſt deny that the Fathers of the old Teſtament were made partakers of the Efficacy of Chriſtes body, or you muſt grant that they no leſſe then we, were made partakers of Chriſtes Body &c. Neither do I diſcourſe, or debate the point touching Chriſtes benefits alone, as if the Fathers were made partakers of ſole grace of the goods & benefits of Chriſt, neither ſpeake I of the efficacy.* And yet againe in another place, he concludeth ſaying, (31) *I plainly ſay, that the ſubſtance or Eſſence of the Body and Bloud of Chriſt, was truly, and in very deed receiued, but no otherwiſe then ſpiritually, of either Fathers, aſwell of thoſe who liued in the Old Teſtament, as of thoſe who haue bene in the New, and yet are.* And for laſt vpſhut of all, wheras the *Lutheran Opponent* againſt this Caluiniſticall conceipt of the Old Fathers Reall eating of Chriſtes Body, had rightly vrged, *Non entis nulla eſſe accidentia, that nothing could haue no accidents*; and therfore Chriſtes Body hauing no Exiſtence, or being at all, could not be eaten at all, (becauſe the eating of Chriſtes body, was an accident to his Body) Grinæus replyeth, (32) *Maiorem negamus eſſe vniuerſalem, in qua dicis non entis eſſe nulla accidentia: we deny the Maior to be vniuerſall, wherin you ſay, that nothing can haue no accidents.* To ſuch groſſe abſurdities are Proteſtantes driuen by this Imaginary Conceipt of receiuing only ſpiritually and by fayth. But the truth is, theſe Caluiniſtes, reſoluing to oppoſe the Catholicke truth, and affecting to haue ſome Nouelty, different from Lutheraniſme and Zwinglianiſme, inuented this of receiuing the true and reall Body of Chriſt ſpiritually and by fayth. A miſtery ſo deepe, as that they thinke, neither mind in thinking, nor tongue in ſpeaking can be equall to expreſſe it.

(30) *Ib. vt ſup. p. 74.*

(31) *Fol. 74. loc. ſup. citato.*

(32) *Vide ib. f. 73. & 77 & 78.*

SECT.

SECT. III.

The Reall Preſence of Chriſtes Body and Bloud in the Sacrament, is proued by Teſtimonies of Scripture taken from the Old Teſtament.

THe figures of the Old Teſtament were accompted (1) *ſhadowes of things to come.* And ſo, that the *Paſchall Lambe* was a figure of the Euchariſt is generally (2) taught, and the ſame may be proued, in that our Sauiour immediatly after the eating of the *Paſchall Lambe*, inſtituted the Euchariſt, thereby to ſignify, that the old Rite was (3) fulfilled in this new Sacrament, and ſo to be taken away: and that the *Paſchall Lambe* of the Iewes was a thing more excellent then the Euchariſt, if therin be not contained the Body of Chriſt, is euident, for if they be conſidered according to their owne natures, a *Lambe* excelleth *bread*, and if they be conſidered as Sacraments or externall ſignes, the difference betwixt them manifeſtly appeareth; for the fleſh of Chriſt is more perfectly ſignifyed by the fleſh of a *Lambe*, then by *bread*: and the death of Chriſt is better repreſented by the death of a *Lambe*, then by *breaking of bread*: and ſo alſo Chriſts innocency, and other properties, are better figured by that choſen *Lambe* without ſpot, which in the Law was commanded to be offered vp & eaten, then by *bread*, which hath none of theſe. S. Auſtine ſpeaking of this figure ſayth, *One thing is the Paſche, which the Iewes celebrated of a ſheep, another that which we receyue in the Body and Bloud of Chriſt.*

The ſame may be alſo proued by the Bloud of the Teſtament, vſed by Moyſes, as God had commanded him, (5) *And he tooke the bloud, and ſprinckled it vpon the People, and ſayd, This is the bloud of the Couenant, which our Lord hath made with you vpon all theſe wordes.* And yet further in the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, (6) *Whereupon neyther was the firſt certes dedicated without bloud: for all the Commandment of the Law being read of Moyſes to all the people: he taking the bloud of Calues and Goates, with water, and ſcarlet wooll,*

(1) *Col.* 2. 17. And ſee S. *Hieron. in c.* 1. *ad Titum.*

(2) *Tert. l.* 4. *in Marcion. Iſichius in c.* 13. *Leuit. Hieron. in c.* 26. *Mat. Chryſoſt. ho. de prodit. Iudæ. Cyp. l. de vnit. Eccleſiæ. Aug. l.* 2. *cont. liter. Petil. c.* 37. *Leo ſer.* 7. *de Paſſ. Dom. Greg. hom.* 22. *in Euang.*

(3) *Luc.* 22. 18. 19. *Mat.* 26. 28.

(4) *L.* 2. *cont. lit. Petil. c.* 17.

(5) *Exod.* 24. 8.

(6) *Heb.* 9. 18.

woell, and Hyſſope, ſprinkled the very Booke alſo it ſelfe, and all the People ſaying, This is the bloud of the Teſtament, which God hath commanded vnto you. The Tabernacle alſo, and all the veſſells of the Miniſtery he in lyke manner ſprinkled with bloud, and all things almoſt according to the law are cleanſed with bloud, and without ſheeding of bloud there is not remiſſion. Now that this figure was fullfilled in the Inſtitution of the Euchariſt, appeareth in that our Sauiour ſayth, (7) *This is the Chalice, the new Teſtament in my bloud,* ſo that at his ſupper his Teſtament was made. Secondly, in that our Sauiour as it were of purpoſe, vſed alſo the ſame worden with Moyſes, ſaying, (8) *For this is my bloud of the new Teſtament.* And thirdly in that our Sauiour, as Moyſes before propoſed a Law, ſo did he, ſaying, (9) *A new Commandement I giue vnto you, that you loue one another:* ſprinkling as it were the bloud into the breaſt of the Apoſtles.

(7) Luc.22. 20.

(8) Mat.26. 28.

(9) Io,13.34.

Now, that this *Bloud* of the Old Teſtament is better then *Wyne*, is eaſily proued by the lyke Argument, whereby we proued a *Lambe*, to be better then *Bread*.

In like ſort the ſame may be proued by the Manna which God rayned downe to the Iewes in the deſert, for that it was a figure of the Euchariſt is manifeſt, by thoſe words of our Sauiour, (10) *Your fathers did eate Manna in the deſert, and they dyed. If any man eate of this bread he ſhall liue for euer.* So alſo S. (11) Paul compared the *red ſea to Baptiſme, and Manna to the Euchariſt*, and the great ſimilitude betweene them, plainly confirmeth the ſame; for *Manna* was giuen in the deſert, whileſt the Children of Iſrael hauing paſſed the *red ſea*, went to the land of promiſe; ſo the (12) Euchariſt is giuen in the deſert of this life, whileſt by Baptiſme we paſſe to our true country, which is lyfe euerlaſting. Manna had this ſingular Prerogatiue, that though ſome ſeemed to gather much, others little, yet all found the ſame meaſure, (13) *and they meaſured by the meaſure of a Gomer: neyther he that gathered more had aboue, nor he that prouided leſſe, found vnder:* ſo in the Euchariſt, the ſame vertue and fruite, is in a litle part of the ſignes, which is in a greater: and that Manna was a figure of the Euchariſt, it is (14) commonly taught by the Ancient Fathers.

(10) Io.6.49. 50.

(11) 1.Cor. 10.1.2.

(12) *Aug. tract.12. in Ioan.*

(13) Exod.16. 18.

(14) *Chryſ. Cyr. Theophil. & Aug. in 6. Ioan. Ambr.l 5. de Sacram.c.1. & de iis qui initiantur myſterijs c.8. & 9.*

Now

Now that Manna was more excellent then our Euchariſt, if it contayne not the Body of Chriſt, is plaine, it being made by the handes of Angels, this of the baker; it coming from heauen, this from the Ouen or fornace; it taſting whatſoeuer the eater deſired, according to that of the Booke of wiſdome, (15) *For the which things thou didſt nourish thy people with the meate of Angels, and bread prepared then gauest them from heauen without labour, hauing in it all delectation, & the ſweetnes of all taſt. For thy ſubſtance did ſhew thy ſweetnes which thou haſt towards thy children, and ſeruing euery mans will, it was turned to that euery man would*: but this of the Euchariſt taſteth only Bread. Manna alſo better repreſented Chriſt, then bare figuratiue bread, it comming from heauen, hauing all ſweetnes, and equall meaſure being receiued by all, though it ſeemed diuerſe: And yet our Sauiour much preferreth the Euchariſt before Manna, ſaying, *Your* (16) *Fathers did eate Manna in the deſert, and they dyed; this is the Bread that deſcendeth from heauen, that if any man eate of it, he dye not. I am the liuing bread that came downe from heauen: If any man eate of this bread, he ſhall liue for euer: and the bread which I will giue is my flesh, for the life of the world.* This preheminence giuen by our Sauiour in this place vnto the Bread, and calling it his fleſh, conuinceth that the ſame is not bread, as only a figure of Chriſtes Body, but euen the Body it ſelfe, and in that reſpect far more excellent then Manna.

(15) Cap. 16. 20. 22.

(16) Ioa. 49. 50. 51.

Againſt theſe Arguments taken from the figures of the Old Teſtament, Peter (17) Martyr replyeth, that though the ſignes and formes of the Sacramentes of the Old and New Teſtament be different, yet the thing receiued by both is the ſame, to wit, Chriſt, (18) S. Paul affirming the Hebrews to haue eaten the ſame meat with vs. But firſt S. Paul doth not ſay, as this lying Martyr forgeth, that the Hebrewes did eate the ſame meat with vs, but only that themſelues did eate the ſame meat. Neither doth he ſay, that bread or drinke of the Hebrewes or the thing receiued in thoſe Sacraments, to haue bene Chriſt, which yet this Martyr affirmeth with greateſt confidence, for his words are truly theſe: *And they drunke of the ſpirituall Rock that followed them, and the*

(17) *In ſua Defenſ. de Euchar. part. 1. p. 602.*

(18) 1. Cor. 10. 3. 4.

Rock was Christ: where he doth not say, that Christ was the water which they did drinke, but the Rock from whence that water flowed: not that materiall Rock from whence the water did visibly flow, but that invisible Rock which did follow the Hebrewes, to wit, Christes prouidence and power, which was the efficient cause of that water, and all other their blessings.

SECT. IV.

That the Scriptures of the New Testament, consonant our forsaid Catholike reall Presence of Christs Body, & Bloud in the Eucharist.

THe first proose is taken from the Promise of our Sauiour saying, (1) *The bread which I will giue is my flesh.* And againe, (2) *Amen, Amen, I say vnto you, vnles you eate the flesh of the sonne of Man, and drinke his Bloud, you shall not haue life in you: he that eateth my flesh and drinketh my Bloud hath life everlasting &c. For my flesh is meat indeed, and my Bloud is drinke indeed.* In answere to this plaine Testimony for the reall Presence, which is so cleere, that nothing can be deuised to be spoken more plainly, yet (3) Prot. reply, that these wordes do not concerne the Eucharist, and therfore by bread, they indeed vnderstand Christ, but not as in the Sacrament, vnder the formes of Bread and wyne, but as taking vpon him our human nature, and we receiuing him by fayth. But besids that the (4) contrary is taught by many Fathers, the truth herof is proued first, in that our Sauiour spake of the tyme to come, when he said, *the bread which I will giue is my flesh*, wheras that spirituall eating of Christ by fayth, is common to all times, the Fathers of the Old Testament receiuing Christ in that sort.

(1) Ioh. 51.
(2) Ib. ver. 53.54.55.

(3) Luth. l. de Capt. Babyl. c. 2. Zuingl. l. de ver. & falf. Relig. c. de Euch. Chemnit. Exam. part. 2. f. 257. Calum. Inſtit. l. 4. c. 17. §. 33.

(4) Chryſ. Aug. Cyr. Theoph. & alij in hunc locum. Orig. ho. 7. in Nu. Baſil. l. 1. de Bap. c. 3. & in reg. mor. c. 21. Cyril. Hier. Catech. 4. Myſtag. Epiph. hær. 55. Theod. hiſt. l. 4. c. 11. Damaſc. l. 4. de fide c. 14. Cypr. Ser. de Orat. Dom & l. 1. conſt. Iudæos. c. 21. Hil. l. 8. de Trinit. Ambr. l. 6. de Sacram. c. 2. & de iis qui initiantur myſteriis. c. 8. & l. 4. de fide c. 5. Hier. Ep. ad Hedib. q. 2. & in. 1. c. ad Eph. Aug. Ser. 2. de verb. Domini, Leo Ser. 6. de Pass. Greg. l. 4. Moral. c. 4. Ber. Ser. 2. in Vigil. Natiu. & ser. 1. de Paschate.

ſort. Secondly the ſimilitude betwixt theſe words of Promiſe, and thoſe of the Inſtitution, *take eate, this is my body, which is giuen for you, to remiſsion of ſinnes*, where the promiſe was performed, confirmeth the ſame. Thirdly it is ſaid, *The Iewes therfore ſtroue amongſt themſelues, ſaying, how can this man giue vs his flesh to eate. And many therfore of his Diſciples hearing it, ſaid, this ſaying is hard, and who can heare it?* From theſe places the deduction is, and very euident, that the Iewes and thoſe Diſciples, thought ſome new and ſtrange thing to be promiſed by Chriſt, and yet our Sauiour did not correct their conceipt, but perſiſted ſtill ſaying, as it followeth in expreſſe wordes, (5) *Iesus therfore ſaid vnto them, Amen, Amen I ſay vnto you, vnles you eate the flesh of the ſonne of Man, and drinke his Bloud, you ſhall not haue life in you; he that eateth my flesh and drinketh my Bloud, hath life euerlaſting. And I will raiſe him vp at the laſt day; for my flesh is meat indeed, and my Bloud is drinke indeed: he that eateth my flesh and drinketh my Bloud, abideth in me and I in him; as the liuing Father hath ſent me, and I liue by the Father, and he that eateth ſhall liue by me. This is the bread that came downe from heauen &c.* And now theſe Texts being ſo plaine, who would imagine that our louing Sauiour would with ſuch offence, ſcandall and hurt, yea Apoſtacy of his Diſciples, whom he loued ſo dearly, couer with ſo many darke pretended Metaphors, a thing ſo eaſy, as to beliue in Chriſt, wheras he might haue declared the ſame almoſt in a word, by telling only that his meaning was no more, then that they ſhould eate his Body and drinke his Bloud ſpiritually, and by faith, or eate only the figure of this Body. (5) Io. 6. 52. 54. 55. 56. 57. 58.

Beſids our B. Sauiour had that eate that his auditors ſhould vnderſtand him, that alwaies when he ſpeake any thing obſcurely in Parables, he was wont to explicate the ſame afterwards to his Diſciples: as (6) firſt where he had tould Nicodemus, *Vnles a man be borne againe, he cannot ſee the Kingdom of God*: and Nicodemus vnderſtood him not, as appeareth by his demand, *how can a man be borne when he is old?* our B. Sauiour explicated his former ſpeach, ſaying, *vnles a man be borne againe of water and of the ſpirit he cannot enter into the Kingdome of God.* Anyone, when Chriſt ſayd, (7) *But he that entreth by the doore is* (6) Io. 3. 3. 4. 5.

(7) Io. 10. 2.

the Pastour of the sheep, and his Disciples vnderstood him not,
(8) Ib. ver. 6 for it followeth, (8) *This Prouerbe Iesus sayd vnto them, but they*
(9) Ib. vers. 7 & 11. *knew not what he speake vnto them*: he explicateth himselfe saying (9) *Amen, Amen I say vnto you, that I am the doore of the sheep. The good sheepheard giueth his life for his sheep.* The like explicatiō of darke speaches, Prouerbs, and Parables, explicated by our Sauiour vnto his Disciples you shall further read of in
(10) Io. 16. 17. 29. 30. another (10) places: so that out of these places, and the lyke
Mat. 13. 36. 37. Mar. 4. 10. 14. 34. I may draw and make this generall Rule and Collection, that our B. Sauiour, howsoeuer sometymes vpon iust occasions, he did not explicate euery darke or parabolicall speach
Luke. 8. 9. 10. 11. vnto the prophane and common people, eyther because they were not capable, or cared not for it, or that it was impertinent vnto them, or for that he would not *cast pearles before swine, or giue the Childrens bread to dogges*: yet neuer spake to his best beloued Disciples, who had left all to follow him, and to whome by his owne Confession it was giuen, as belonging vnto them, to vnderstand all mysteries belonging to the Kingdome of God; for as much as they were not only thereby to saue their own soules, but many others, which they could not haue done without a true conceipt and right vnderstanding of all that proceeded from our B. Sauiour his sacred mouth: To these I say, his best beloued Disciples, he neuer spake any thing parabolically, but at one tyme or other ordinarily he explicated the same, and so left them possessed and inuested with the true and right sense of his meaning. And shall we thinke, that heere he would not haue done the like, but that the sense was easy, plaine and litterally to be vnderstood, as the very words went & sounded? And yet we see heere he doth not declare himselfe o-
(11) Io. 6. 67. therwise, but saith to them who did not depart, (11) *What will you also depart*, as if he should haue sayd, I haue not otherwise to tell you, he that will not beleiue, let him depart.

Fourthly, spirituall receiuing by fayth, needeth not that frequent distinction of Flesh & Bloud, Meat & drinke, seeing that in receiuing by fayth all is one to eate and drinke

seeing

ſeeing that in receiuing by fayth all is one to eate & drinke.

Fiftly, our Sauiour would neuer ſo ſeriouſly by Oath haue auouched ſaying, *Amen, Amen*, that we muſt eate this fleſh, if he had meant the ſame onely figuratiuely, ſeeing Oathes muſt be made of things playne and certaine, & not of things figuratiuely ſpoken.

Sixtly, the Iewes and the Diſciples offended not in miſvnderſtanding our Sauiours wordes, but in not belieuing them, ſaying accordingly (12) *How can this man giue vs his fleſh to eate?* And, (13) *this ſaying is hard, who can heare it?* Our Sauiour alſo in the beginning of his ſpeach in this matter, exhorteth them to belieue, ſaying, (14) *He that belieueth in me hath lyfe euerlaſting*: and in the later end he noteth their not belieuing, and ſayth, (15) *But there be certayne of you which beleeue not: He ſayd not*, ſayth S. (16) Auguſtine, *There be ſome among you which vnderſtand not.*

(12) *Io. 6. 52.* (13) *Ib. verſ. 60.* (14) *Ib. verſ. 47.* (15) *Ib. verſ. 64.* (16) *In Ioan. Tract. 27.*

Beſids, if they had beene miſtaken in taking that litterally, which our Sauiour ſpake figuratiuely, he would neuer ſo earneſtly haue perſuaded them to belieue his wordes without any Explication, ſeeing none can belieue that which they do not in ſome ſort vnderſtand; neyther is it credible, that he who thirſteth after ſaluation of Soules, would ſuffer his owne Diſciples to depart from him, if he might haue recalled them, by affirming only that his foreſayd words were figuratiue. Laſtly Peter (17) Martyr confeſſeth, that the *Capharnaites* hearing our Sauiour his words, *did thinke, that Chriſts fleſh ſhould be eaten corporally as the Papiſtes thinke.* Whereupon it followeth, that ſeeing the *Capharnaites* were reprehended for not belieuing as they vnderſtood, that therfore the Papiſtes beliefe, is a right beliefe.

(17) *L. cons. Gardineri cum. ob. 34.*

But ſome reply, that our Sauiour explicated himſelfe, when he ſayd (18) *It is the ſpirit that quickneth, the fleſh profiteth nothing; the words that I haue ſpoken vnto you, are ſpirit and lyfe.* Anſw. When our Sauiour ſaith, *The fleſh profiteth nothing*, he doth not vnderſtand the ſame of his owne fleſh (which doubtles profiteth our Redemption) but of the (19) carnall vnderſtanding of the Capharnaites, as S. Chryſoſtome and other Fathers do expound it: which Explication to be true, appea-

(18) *Io. 6. 63.* (19) *Chryſoſt. Theophil. Euthymius in hunc locum. Orig. l. 3. in Epiſt. ad Rom. Cyp. ſer. de cœna Domini.*

appeareth first, in that the word *flesh* is vsually taken in Scriptures, for carnall wisdome and vnderstanding, as (20) *You iudge according to the flesh. Flesh* (21) *and blood hath not reuealed this vnto thee.* (22) *The wisdome of the flesh is death: The wisdome of the flesh is an Enemy to God.* I (23) *could not speake vnto you as to spirituall, but as to carnall.* (24) *We speake not in learned wordes of humane wisdome, but in the Doctrine of the spirit &c. But the sensuall man perceiueth not those thinges that are of the spirit of God.* And in this sense the *flesh profiteth nothing*, that is, to vnderstand the flesh of Christ to be eaten after a carnall manner, as though it were to be deuided into parts, and to be boyled, rosted, broyled, and chewed, and conuerted into the substance of the receiuer. And according to this saith S. Chrisostome, (25) *what then, the flesh profiteth nothing, he doth not speake this of his owne flesh, god forbid, but of those who vnderstand carnally what is spoken.* And a litle after, *know, that this particle, the flesh profiteth nothing, is not spoken of his flesh, but of a Carnall hearing.* The like Explication is giuen also by S. Cyprian in these wordes, (26) *There rose a question of the newnes of this speach, as it is read in the Ghospell of Iohn: and the auditors were astonished at the Doctrine of this Mistery, when our Lord said, Vnles ye shall eate the flesh of the sonne of Man, and shall drinke his blood, you shall not haue lyfe in you. Which because certaine of them did not beleiue, nor could vnderstand, they went back, because it seemed to them horrible and wicked to eate mans flesh, thinking that it was spoken in such sort, that they should be taught to eate his flesh, either boyled or rosted, and cut in peeces, whereas the flesh of that person, if it should be deuided in peeces, could not suffice all Mankind, and which being once consumed, Religion would seeme to haue perished, no Sacrifice remayning vnto it any longer. But in these kind of thoughtes, flesh and blood doth not profit any thing: because, as the Maister himselfe hath expounded, these wordes are spirit and lyfe: neither doth Carnall sense penetrate to the vnderstanding of so great depth, vnles faith be added to it.* In like sort answereth S. Austine, (27) *O Lord my good Maister, how doth the flesh profit nothing, seeing thou sayest, vnles one shall eate my flesh, and shall drinke my blood he shall not haue lyfe in him? doth flesh profit nothing, and for what end are we that which we are, but that we may haue lyfe euerlasting, which thou promisest by thy flesh? What is then,*

(20) *Io.* 8 19.
(21) *Mat.* 16. 17.
(22) Rom. 8. & 7.
(23) 1. Cor. 3. 1.
(24) 1. Cor. 2. 13. 14.
(25) Chrysost. *in Ioan. hom.* 46.
(26) *Ser. de cœna Domini.*
(27) *Tract.* 27. *in Ioan.* n. 63.

vbed, it profiteth nothing? The flesh profiteth nothing, but as they vnderstood it, for they so vnderstood flesh, as it is torne in the carcasse, or sold in the shambles, not as it is quickned with the spirit. And againe, *For if the flesh profited nothing, the Word would not haue ben flesh, that it might dwell in vs.* And a litle after, *As they haue vnderstood flesh, I do not giue so my flesh to eate.* So fully and cleerly do the Fathers answere this Common Obiection.

Secondly, as by *flesh* is vnderstood knowledge depending vpon sense and reason, so by *spirit* and *lyfe* (which is here opposed to flesh) is vnderstood such knowledge as being aboue humane and naturall reason, submitteth it selfe to faith; which opposition and explication, the Apostle before expressed saying, (28) *The wisdome of the flesh, is death, the wisdome of the spirit is lyfe.* And for this want of faith, our Saviour in the same place complaineth, saying: *But there are some of you which do not believe.*

(28) Rom. 8. 6.

Thirdly, the word *spirit*, or *spirituall*, can nothing hinder the Reall-presence, seeing it is said of the Body, (29) *It is sowen a naturall Body, it shall aryse a spirituall Body, if there be a naturall Body, there is also a spirituall Body.*

(29) 1. Cor. 15. 44.

Lastly it cannot be vnderstood of the eating of the flesh of Christ, *that it profiteth nothing*, seeing our Saviour saith there himselfe plainly, (30) *He that eateth my flesh &c. hath lyfe everlasting*, and (31) *vnles you eate the flesh of the Sonne of man &c. you shall not haue lyfe in you.* So evident is it, that those obscurer words make nothing indeed against the other plentiful, most cleere and manifest sayings to the contrary. And yet all this not withstanding, (32) Hospinian relateth that Zwinglius in sundry places inculcateth, that flesh eaten profiteth nothing. And therefore Zwinglius inventeth these strange interpretations (33) *Flesh in this place Ioan. 6. is put for the disinenatured*; so that by *flesh* must be vnderstood Christs Divinity: And, (34) *Thou seest here Io. 6. the Body and Blood of Christ to be nothing else, then the word of fayth*: to wit, *that his Body dead for vs, and his blood shed for vs., hath redeemed vs*: heere *flesh* must be vnderstood *fayth*, or *Christs death*. But these are ouer grosse to require confutation.

(30) Io. 6. 54.
(31) Ib. vers. 53.
(32) Hist. part. 2. fo. 21.
(33) In Exeges. fol. 150.
(34) Tom. 1. in Explicat. Art. 18. fol. 37.

The second proofe out of the new Testament, is taken from

from the words of the Inſtitution of the Sacrament; where our Sauiour performed his former promiſe, when at his laſt Supper, (35) *He tooke bread and bleſſed and brake, and he gaue to his Diſciples and ſayd, take yee, and eate, this is my Body. And taking the Chalice he gaue thankes, and gaue to them ſaying, drinke yee all of this, for this is my Blood of the new Teſtament, which ſhalbe shed for many vnto remiſsion of ſinnes.* Theſe wordes of themſelues are moſt plaine for the real Preſence, and almoſt euery word doth confirme the ſame. In ſo much that Zwinglius ſpeaking heereof ſayth, (36) *what can be ſpoken more clearly, then, This is my body?* In like ſort Caluin, (37) *I do not deny, but that Chriſt would ſpeake moſt plainly.* Beza, (38) *Chriſt could not ſpeake more plainly or ſignificantly of the Sacraments.* And the like is acknowledged by ſundry other Proteſtants.

(35) *Mat.* 26. *Mar.* 14. 22. 23 24. *Luke.* 22. 19. 20. 1. *Cor* 11. 24 25.
(36) *In Explanat. Art.* 28.
(37) *Admonit. vlt. ad VVeſtphal. p.* 812. *Beza ad rabeſit. Sanctiſ. p.* 8.
(38) *Muſculus in loc. tit. de cœna.* Perkins of the ſupper. Col. 858. *Hoſpin. Hiſt. part.* 1. *c.* 2.

Yea theſe wordes of Chriſt are ſo playne for vs, that Caluin will not haue (39) *The wordes of Chriſt to be made ſubiect to the common Rule, nor to be ſquared by the Grammer.* And indeed the words of Inſtitution are ſo conuincing, that Proteſtants refuſe to be tryed thereby. Peter Martyr ſayth, (40) *That which he addeth is Idle, that in the myſtery of the Euchariſt we are to fly to the words of our Lord ordayning it.* Caluin (41) *It is not agreable to reaſon, to inſiſt in the eſſentiall Verbe* (is). Bullinger, (42) *We deſire of our Aduerſaries, that they do not hereafter as heertofore they haue done, make the wordes of the Lords Supper, wherof the Controuerſy is, as it were the foundation of their opinion.* Zwinglius (43) *We do not reply of thoſe wordes* (of the Supper) *but vpon this one word, The flesh profiteth nothing.* Yea they ſcornefully call this proofe, (44) *A fyue words proofe.* Burenſis calleth the, (45) *four impotent words.* Shelden, (46) *fiue omnipotent words.* Hoſpinian (47) *fyue magicall words.* And Peter Martyr further ſaith (48) *You haue alwaies ſeemed to me to be leſſe wiſe then is meet, when you ſo labour for an opinion as abſurd as vnprofitable, nor haue any thing to defend it but the word of Chriſt, This is my Body.* So that the wordes of Chriſt himſelfe, though moſt plaine, muſt not now be ſufficient to confute and confound an hereticke, though neuer ſo abſurd.

(39) *Inſtit.* 4. *c.* 17. *ſ.* 10.
(40) *Cont. Gardiner. fol.* 440.
(41) *De rat. Concor. p.* 866.
(42) *Apud Schluſſelb. l.* 4. *Theol. Calvin. art.* 20.
(43) *De vera & fal. Relig. c. de Euchar. p.* 267.
(44) *Pet. Mart. apud Schluſſ l.* 4.

But

Theol. Caluin. art. 20. (45) *Apud Schluſſ tom.* 3. *catal. hæret in Præfat.* (46) *De miraculis Antichriſti. p.* 82. (47) *Hiſt. part.* 2. *fol.* 63. (48) *In Dial. Col.* 130.

But though the wordes be thus confeſſedly plaine as you haue ſeene, yet Prot. greatly labour by ſundry ſleightes to euade them; for ſo concerning the word, *bleſſed*, whereas we affirme that our Sauiour vſed not to bleſſe inſenſible creatures, but when he was to worke ſome great and wonderfull thing: (49) ſo that his Benediction was not only praying, but euen working, as when God gaue (50) *Fecundity* to liuing creatures, it is ſaid, *he bleſſed them*; Euen as on the contrary, when Chriſt curſed the fig-tree, forthwith it withered. Proteſtantes reply, that *bleſſing*, is not referred to the Bread, but that therby only praiſe and thankesgiuing is giuen to God. But firſt ſeeing S. Matke ſaith, (51) *Ieſus tooke bread, and bleſſing, brake and gaue to them*, it cannot be ſaid, but as, *brake*, and *gaue* are referred to the matter which was in his hands, ſo alſo, *bleſſed*, muſt likewiſe be referred to the ſame matter. Secondly S. Paul directly applyeth the *bleſſing* to the Cup, ſaying, (52) *The Chalice of Benediction which we bleſſe &c.* And in like ſort it is vnderſtood by the Ancient (53) Fathers. But yet for all this Zwinglius expoundeth Bleſſing thus, (54) *It came to paſſe when he bleſſed, that is, when he bad them farewell.* So that bleſſing the bread in the Inſtitution of the B. Sacrament, is a bidding farewell to the Apoſtles: to ſuch blind abſurdity doth obſtinacy bring an hereticke.

(49) Io. 6. 11 Mat. 15. 36. Mar. 8. 07. Io. 11 44. Luc. 9 16.
(50) Gen. 1. 22.
(51) 14. 22.
(52) 1. Cor. 10. 16.
(53) Iuſtin. in Apol. 2. liturg. Iacobi, Baſilij, Chryſoſt. Cypr. l. 2. Ep. 3. ad Cæcilium.

But when ſuch fooliſh Interpretations will not ſerue their turne, then they ſpare not to corrupt the Text it ſelfe: for ſo, becauſe the words, *Benediction*, and *we bleſſe*, in thoſe wordes of the Apoſtle (55) *The Chalice of Benediction which we do bleſſe*, do proue the wine in the Chalice to be conſecrated: Zwinglius in great diſlike therof, ſayth, (56) *They ought not to vſe in this place the words of Benediction and bleſſing, for theſe are vſually taken almoſt for the word of Conſecrating.* And therfore to auoyd *Conſecration*, he tranſlateth the ſaid wordes thus, (57) *The Cup of thankesgiuing wherwith we giue thankes, is it not the Communion of the Bloud of Chriſt?* Caluin (58) alſo not only expoundeth the word εὐλογήσας, *benedixit*, *bleſſed*, *gratias egit*, *gaue thankes*; but alſo in the very Text of S. Matthew he tranſlateth, *when he had giuen thankes*: And yet as himſelfe

(54) Tom. 2. in Exegeſi fol. 333.
(55) 1. Cor. 10. 16.
(56) De cœna. fol. 294. Tom. 2.
(57) Tom. 4. in 1. Cor. p. 470.
(58) In Math. 26. 26.

ſelfe there confeſſeth, *Marke and Mathew vſe the word of bleſsing.* This iniury vnto the ſacred Text is ſo great, that Illyricus (59) ſaith therof, (59) *Some corrupt this Texte, tranſlating the Cup of thanksgiuing wherwith we giue thankes, and ſo they vſe in their Lyturgies a corrupted Texte, inſteed of the wordes of Inſtitution, or the ſacred ſupper, doubling their Sacriledge.* To this Corruption of the Texte of Scripture, our Prot. ſtill flye, when all other ſhiftes do faile them.

(59) *In 1. Cor. 5.*

But to proceed, (for few of theſe ſacred wordes muſt eſcape them, againſt which they will not offer ſome violence) by the Pronowne, *this*, ſome Prot. vnderſtand Bread or wine, making the ſenſe to be this, This Bread is my Body. But this to be falſe, appeareth in that the word, *this*, muſt either be taken ſubſtantiuely, or adiectiuely; if the later, then it cannot agree with Bread or wine, ſeeing *this* both in Greeke τοῦτο, and in Latin, *Hoc*, is the neuter Gender, which agreeth with *Body*, which alſo is in Greeke, τὸ σῶμα, and in Latin, *Corpus*, the neuter Gender; wheras *bread* both in Greeke, ἄρτος, and Latin *Panis*, is the Maſculine Gender. So alſo *wine* in Greeke is the Maſculine Gender, and *Bloud*, the Neuter: and ſo *this* is the Neuter Gender, to wit, τοῦτο; *hoc*, not, οὗτος, *hic*. And of the contrary in Latin, *wine* is the Neuter Gender, and *Bloud* the Maſculine, and yet all read, *hic eſt ſanguis.* If, *this*, be taken ſubſtantiuely, for, this thing, then it cannot be vnderſtood of *Bread*, for it cannot be ſo taken, when the thing it ſelfe is preſent, & openly ſeene & knowne, vnles the ſaid thing be alſo of the Neuter Gender: Wheras here our Sauiour *tooke bread, accepit panem* &c. and ſaid, *hoc eſt* &c. Who ſeeing his Brother preſent, and pointing to him, would ſay, *Hoc eſt frater meus, this thing is my Brother.*

Danæus obſeruing the great aduantage giuen here by the Pronowne, *This*, hath inuented an excellent helpe in theſe words; (60) *What if I ſhall except the naturall wordes of Chriſt, to haue bene only theſe two, My flesh: I ſhall with one word make void, all that proofe of the Pronowne, Hoc, This.* Nothing leſſe, but you would ſtrongly proue your ſelfe to be a man void of all honeſty or conſcience, by ſo groſly corrupting the

(60) *L. de Euchar. c. 1. p. 543.*

the word of God. Some Puritanes are not aſhamed to miſtranſlate the words thus, *This Bread is my Body*: of which addition to the Text M. Hutton ſaith, (61) *Had it beene in our Communion booke, we ſhould haue bene challenged for adding theſe words (This bread) more, then is in the Euangeliſts, or S. Paul* &c. But the matter is ſo cleere that Caroloſtadius doth referre the particle (62) *This*, not to *Bread*, but to *Chriſts Body*: wherof he giueth this good reaſon, (63) τοῦτο *is a Greeke pronowne of the neuter Gender: now the word* ἄρτος, *in Latin panis, is the Maſculine, and therfore the pronowne* τοῦτο *cannot be ioyned to it* &c. *Therfore I muſt of neceſsity confeſſe, that Chriſt ſaying, This is my Body, to haue pointed vnto his Body, not to bread.* So cleere and confeſſed it is, that the pronowne, *This*, cannot relate to *bread*, but to *Body*.

(61) Anſw. to the laſt part of reaſons for refuſall of ſubſcription. p. 259. 266.

(62) *In Zwingl. l. Epiſt. p. 543.*

(63) *In dial. de cœna.*

Beſides all this S. Luke plainly ſayth, (*) τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον, ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυνόμενον: *Hic calix Nouum Teſtamentum in ſanguine meo pro vobis effuſus*, where the wordes, *which is ſhed*, in Greeke, differing in Caſe from *Bloud*, and in Gender from *Teſtament*, haue true relation only to the *Cup*: now it was not the veſſell or wine which was ſhed for vs, but the true Bloud of Chriſt, therfore the Cup doth not ſignify the Cup of wyne, but the Cup of Bloud.

(*) *Luc.* 22. 20.

To this Argument, Beza had no other Anſwere, but only to deny the Text of the Ghoſpell to be perfect, for writing vpon this place he ſayth, (64) *Seeing theſe wordes, if we looke vnto the Conſtruction, do neceſſarily belong not to bloud, but to the Cup, and yet they cannot be vnderſtood of the wyne, much leſſe of the Cup, either it is a manifeſt incongruity, ſeeing it ſhould haue bene ſaid,* τῷ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυνομένῳ: *or rather, ſeeing theſe were noted at the Margine of Matthew and Marke, they afterwardes crept into the Texte.* And agreably Beza in his Latin Tranſlation changeth, *Quod*, into, *Qui*, ſaying, *Hoc poculum eſt Nouum illud Teſtamentum per ſanguinem meum, qui pro vobis effunditur.* And the ſame Corruption is vſed in the French Caluinian Bibles. But it ſeemes this charging S. Luke with incongruity, did make him ſomewhat aſhamed of himſelfe: And therfore in another place he ſayth, (65) *My Coniectures tend to this, that rather then I will contend Luke to haue committed a Solœcoſbe-*

(64) *Annot. in Luc. 22.*

(65) *Ad Reſponſ. Sanctiſ. c. 8. p. 28.*

nes, either this particle, to &c. to be inserted into Lukes Texte, out of the other Euangelistes, or to haue beno casually il changed by the writers (or Printers) although Coppies do agree: to such hard shiftes is Beza driuen.

(66) In Refut. Sophism. Hunnij. p. 648.
(67) Loc. 48. p. 658.
(68) Resp. ad Conf. §. Lutheri. Tom. 2. fol. 111.
(69) Ad rat. 2. Camp p. 12.

Piscator will (66) not admit, τὸ ὑπερεκχυνόμενον, to be referred to the Cup, and addeth that, *It may be, that Clause crept out of Matthew.* Bucanus acknowledgeth that, (67) *If we looke into the construction of the wordes according to Luke*, τὸ ὑπερεκχυνόμενον, *is referred to the Cup.* Zwinglius thinketh that it is (68) an Enallage of the Nominative Case for the Datiue: but if it were lawfull to go by, *may be*, and such strange changing of Cases, any man may from Scripture defend what he list. But this truth is so cleere, as that our owne Whitaker confesseth that, (69) *If thou wilt adhere to the wordes themselues, it is necessary either that thou confesse the Cup to be shed for vs, or that thou bring in a Solœcisme:* which is either to acknowledge our Catholicke Reall Presence, or to accuse the Euangelist of Incongruity.

(70) Humfred. de Rat. interpret. l. 2. p. 62. 63.
(*) Gesnerus in Biblioth. Sebast. Castal. Purius in Defens. Cast. p. 136.
(71) Annot. in Luc. 22. 20.
(72) Answere to Reinolds p. 210.
(73) In Luc. 22.

But Castalio, (whose Translation is by seuerall (70) Prot. preferred before all others) translateth thus, (*) *Hoc poculum est Nouum fœdus, quod fit per meum sanguinem, quod est pro vobis effundendum:* so plainly referring *quod* and *effundendum*, to *poculum*, and not to *sanguinem*. And Beza himselfe confesseth that, (71) *These wordes if we respect Construction, necessarily do not belong to the bloud, but to the Cup.* Agreably to which saith Whitaker, (72) *The wordes in Luke 22. 20. in the Greeke that Beza translated, by Construction indeed require, that the Cup is called the New Testament, which is shed for vs: In which respect Beza translateth them otherwise &c.* But Enthymius expounding these wordes saith expresly, (73) *That which is said, which is shed for you, is to be referred to the Cup.* So vnanswerable are the wordes of Scripture, when they are not corrupted by Protestantes.

To come now to the litle word, *is*, Zwinglians therby vnderstand, *to signify*: but this to be false, appeareth, in that it hath another signification most ordinary and common, in so much as all other *verbes* are resolued into this, and some other thing. Wherfore Ochinus maketh this strange Exasion saying,

saying, (74) *We answere it may be that when Christ said, This is my Body, he would haue said, This bread signifyeth my Body.* So making it doubtfull whether Christ spake those wordes, which he would and intended to speake. But I will answere this impious foolery with the wordes of S. Hilary, (75) *Doth he which is the Word, not know the signification of the word &c. And he that is vertue, was he in that infirmity, that he could not vtter what he would haue to be vnderstood? he vttered plainly the true and sincere Sacramentes of Euangelicall faith.*

(74) *Apud Schluſſ. l. 2. Theol. Calu. Art. 23. fol. 115.*

(75) *L. 8 de Trinit.*

Zwinglius hath a better shift, which the Prot. Schluſſelburge relateth in these wordes, (76) *It is most certaine that the Sacramentaries do falsify and change the word of God himselfe: And truly we haue a notable and euident Example of this in Zwinglius l de vera & fal. Relig p. 262. where in retitall of the wordes of Institution of the supper of God, for the verbe is, he putteth, signifieth for so Zwinglius reciteth the Text: So therfore hath Luke, with whom of the Euangelistes, we will content our selues: And taking Bread, he gaue thankes, and brake, and gaue them, saying, This signifyeth my Body which is giuen for you: hitherto Zwinglius &c. Neither can this wickednes of Zwinglius be excused, with any colour, the thing is most manifest &c.*

(76) *Theol. Calum. l. 2. art. 6. fol. 43.*

And in like sort the Tigurines in their Bibles, haue changed it into (*significat, doth signify*) as (77) Schluſſelburge testifieth himselfe, to haue seene and read. And Zwinglius himselfe dared to write thus, (78) *So therfore hath Luke, with whom of the Euangelistes we will be content, Hoc significat Corpus meum quod pro vobis datur: this signifyeth my Body which is giuen for you.* For as himselfe confesseth elswhere, (79) *If (est, is,) be put substantiuely, it must needs be confessed, the true substance of Christes true flesh to be present in the Supper.* And, (80) *If thou take, est, is, substantiuely, then the Papistes haue conquered.* This Corruption is so grosse and wicked, that the Prot. Schluſſelburge sayth therof, (81) *This only one Corruption of the wordes of the Supper of God, ought to terrify all men, from the Company and impiety of the Caluinistes.*

(77) *Theol. Calum. l. 2. c. 6 fol. 44.*

(78) *Tom. 2. de vera & fal. Relig. c. de Eucharistia, fol. 210.*

(79) *Tom. 2. l. de coena, fol. 274.*

(80) *Resp ad Bullican. fol. 264.*

(81) *Theol. Calum. l. 2. c. 6. fol. 43.*

The absurdity heerof is yet further proued by these words of S. Luke, *This Cup the new Testament in my Blood*: where the sentence standing thus imperfect, for want of a Verbe to knit

knit the partes togeather, it cannot be supplied by the word *signifyeth*, becaule the Nowne, *Teſtament*, is heere put in the Nominatiue Caſe, whereas the word, *ſignifyeth*, would require the Accuſatiue. Wherfore in this reſpect, Prot. in their Bybles, are enforced to ſupply the ſentence with the Verbe, *is*. Now is it but coulourable, that the Verbe, *is*, being not expreſſed, but only vnderſtood, and thereupon placed to make vp the ſenſe of the Text, ſhould ſo ſoone as it is ſo of neceſſity placed, be immediatly caſt out, and changed into the verbe *ſignifyeth*: that the vſe of ſpeaking doth often make it left out, as being eaſy to be ſupplied or vnderſtood, I willingly graunt; but that euer any vſe of ſpeach, ſhould in ſuch caſe, cauſe it to be (as in this exãple) brought in & placed, & yet withal to looſe its proper ſignification, is no leſſe ſtrange, then is our Aduerſaries Doctrine grounded thereupon. And ſeeing the Pronowne, *this*, as I haue proued, cannot relate to *Bread*, but to *Body*, to ſay, that his Body ſhould ſignify his Body, were more then Idle. And therfore M. Hooker & other Prot. teach, that there can be no figure in the word, *is*. M. Hookers words are, (82) *We do not interpret the wordes of Chriſt, as if the name of his Body, did import but the figure of his Body, and to, be, were only to*, ſignify.

(82) *Eccl. Pol. l. 5. ſect. 67. p. 177.*

By the word, *Body*, ſome vnderſtand Chriſt his myſticall Body, to wit, his *Church*: but this is moſt abſurd, it not being giuen for vs, nor ſhed for vs, nor yet can poſſibly be eaten of vs. Others a ſigne of his Body; but this cannot be, for as not a ſigne of his Body, but the true Body of Chriſt, was giuen for vs vpõ the Croſſe, ſo alſo Chriſts Body in the Scipture is neuer taken, but eyther for his myſticall or true naturall Body. This is ſo certaine, that D. Whitaker and M. Hooker do both confeſſe, That, (83) *The Trope is not in the Body or Blood of Chriſt, nor in bread or wyne &c.* Beſides, the Pronowne, *This*, not ſignifying *Bread* (as before) there is not any thing whereof a ſigne of the Body ſhould be affirmed or predicated, vnles they will haue the Naturall Body of Chriſt, to be a ſigne of it ſelfe.

(81) *Whitak. Cont. Dur. l. 2. p. 280. Hook. Eccl. Pol. l 5. ſect. 67. pa. 177.*

(84) *Collatio Cath. & orth fidei, p. 158.*

But all this is ſo impertinent, that other Prot. diſclaime in affirming, that, (84) *in the words of Chriſts Teſtament, by the word,*

word, Body, they vnderſtand nothing els, but the figure of Chriſts Body, the true Preſence of Chriſts Body denyed. And the very ſame is affirmed by (85) M. Hooker.

Zuinglius is of opinion, that, (86) *Body in the words of the Supper, may alſo be expounded for the Church.* And, (87) *Heer by the words of Chriſt are made cleere, This is my Body, where Body is put for Death:* according to which, Chriſt is made to ſay, Take yee, and eate, This is my Church, or this is my Death. Ridiculous.

To proceed, theſe other wordes, *is giuen for you, is ſhed for you*, according to the Greeke in all the three Euangeliſts, and S. Paul, are in the Preſent tenſe, and before his Paſſion, and therefore cannot agree to Bread and wyne, which cannot be ſayd to haue beene then giuen for vs: neyther to his giuing vpon the Croſſe, for that guift was not then preſent; they do therefore only relate to his Body and Bloud, which he then gaue & offered for vs at his laſt Supper. Now whereas Fulke replyeth that, (88) *The Apoſtles and Euangeliſtes vſed the Preſent tenſe for the Future, as ſignifying Chriſts Paſſion was at hand: and that the Vulgar Interpreter tranſlateth accordingly*, (89) *which ſhallbe ſhed*: it is eaſily anſwered, that though the Preſent tenſe be vſed ſometymes for the future, yet much more often to ſignify a thing preſent: and the rather heere, in that not one only, but all the three Euangeliſts, and S. Paul do to our Sauiours action then preſent, add and vſe the Preſent tenſe. As for the vulgar Tranſlation, Prot. are in great ſtraits when they do appeale from the Originall text to it, which they affirme to be (90) *An old rotten Tranſlation, full of Corruptions in all parts thereof, and of all others moſt corrupt*. But yet in defence of the vulgar Interpreter, I ſay, that as he tranſlateth in the Future tenſe, which ſhalbe ſhed; ſo alſo he vſeth the Preſent tenſe, tranſlating (91) *which is giuen*, both which he vſeth to ſignify a certaine truth, the Preſent tenſe ſignifying, that his Body was then giuen in the Sacrament, the future not impugning the former ſenſe, but ſignifying withall further, that it ſhould be then, and alſo afterwards giuen vpon the Croſſe. So little do theſe Euaſions preuaile againſt the truth.

(85) *Eccl. Pol. l. 5. ſect.* 67.

(86) *Apud Schluſſel. in Theol. Calu. l. 1. art.* 12. *fol.* 102.

(87) *Tom.* 4. *in Io.* 6.

(88) *Ag. Rhem. Teſt. in Mat.* 26 *ſect.* 10.

(89) *Mat.* 26. 28.

(90) Whitak. in his Anſwere to Reinolds. p. 25. 26. 344.

(91) *Luc.* 22. 19.

The

The third proofe is taken from ſuch places as contayne the vſe of this Sacrament, as (92) *The Chalice of Benediction which we do bleſſe, is it not the Communication of the* (93) *Blood of Chriſt? and the Bread which we breake, is it not the participation of the Body of our Lord?* As alſo, (94) *he that eateth and drinketh vnworthily, eateth and drinketh iudgment, or* (as the Prot. Tranſlation hath it) *damnation, to himſelfe not diſcerning the Body of our Lord:* or, as it is elswhere; (95) *ſhalbe guilty of the Body and Bloud of our Lord.* Here ſome are reprehended for receiuing vnworthily the *Body* (96) *and Bloud of Chriſt*; but theſe receiue not with ſpirit and faith, for then they receiued, according to Prot. worthily, therfore they receiue only with the Body, and yet, as ſo, they are ſaid to receiue the Body and Bloud of Chriſt, euen to the vnworthy Receiuer: therfore the Body of Chriſte is preſent in the Eucharift; for as it is in heauen, it cannot be receiued with the corporall mouth. I wil but name vnto you the Interpretation made by Zwinglius of theſe wordes, *The Chalice of Benediction which we bleſſe*, which he expoundeth thus, (97) *The Cup of thankesgiuing wherwith we giue thankes, what I pray you is it, elſe then we our ſelues?* So that according to him, Bleſſing is only Thankesgiuing, and the Cup, is our ſelues, that drinke the Cup.

Laſtly by theſe wordes, *This is my Body*, our Sauiour inſtituted a Sacrament, and which is more, with a Commandement therto annexed, ſaying, *Take eate &c. Do this* &c. He alſo hereby made his laſt Will, and Teſtament, which he would neuer do in wordes ſo figuratiue and obſcure, as that the moſt learned could not vnderſtand the ſame, ſeeing therby inſteed of greateſt Bleſſings, which doubtles he only intended, he ſhould haue giuen and left vnto vs moſt dangerous occaſions of errours, ſcandall, ruine, miſchiefe, ſtryfe and Contention. And I would demaund of a Sacramentary Miniſter, whoſe Father making his will, ſhould by expreſſe wordes and writing, make this his ſonne his heire of all his gould; what he would thinke of that Iudge, who ſhould expound his Fathers wordes not of true gould, but of Counters, figures, or Pictures of gold? Certainly he would thinke his ſentence to be falſe, vniuſt, & malicioufly wreſted.

(92) 1. Cor. 10. 16.
(93) See Chriſoſt. ho. 24. in 1. ad Cor. c. 10.
(94) 1. Cor. 11. 29.
(95) Ib. verſ. 27.
(96) Baſil. l. 2. de Bap. c. 3. Chryſ. ho. 24. in 1. Cor. ho. 83. in Mat. ho. 45. in Io. Hieron. in c. 2. Malach. Theophil. Oecom. cum. Ambr. Theodor. in. 1. Cor. c. 11. Aug. l. 3. de Bap. c. 8. l. 1. cont. Creſc. c. 25. Ep. 120. ad Honorat. c. 27. 21. ep. 162.
(97) In 1. Cor. 10.

wrested. Now if his Fathers mind was truly agreable to this Sentence, then would he complaine, that his owne Father had deceiued him: none of which without blasphemy can be applyed to Christ.

But this is a truth so certaine, that Melanchon sayth, (98) *I do not fynd a firme reason, why by the name of Body in the wordes of the Supper, only the signe of a Body absent, should be vnderstood, for although in the sacred Scriptures, there be wordes full of figures of all sortes, yet there is great difference betweene the narrations of thinges done, and diuine ordinations, or decrees of the nature, or will of God &c. For it is necessary that the meaning of those places be certaine from whence Decrees, or Articles be taken: if it were lawfull to interpret these any waye, all thinges might be depraued &c.* In like sort Musculus acknowledgeth that, (99) *Christ at his last supper made his Testament, which argueth that he did it in wordes plaine to be vnderstood; for as the Apostle sayth,* (100) *A mans Testament being confirmed no man despiseth, or further disposeth,* according to Beza's Translation, *if it be but a mans Testament &c. no man addeth thereto,* much lesse then to our Sauiours Testament may Prot. add so many of their owne most different and absurd Glosses. To this purpose sayth Andræas, (101) *The words of Christ are the words of a Testament, in which he speaketh expressely and perspicuously, that his will may be vnderstood by al.* But to conclude, what Scriptures can be so plaine, or reason so conuincing for the recalling of an Heretike, when Zwinglius auouched, as before, that, (*) *Although God with all his Blessed Angels, should descend from heauen, and should sweare in the Supper of the Lord the Body and Bloud of Christ to be giuen to all that receyue it, yet I neyther could, nor would beleeue* (saith he) *vnles with my eyes and hands I should see and feele the same.*

Yea so plaine are the words of Scripture in our behalfe, that Zwinglius sayth (102) *What can be spoken more cleerly, then, This is my Body?* Caluin (103) *I do not deny*, but that Christ would speake most cleerly. Beza, (104) *Christ could not speake more expressely, and more significantly of the Sacramentes.* And (105) *we haue truly often said, that which now also I will repeat, that there cannot be kept vi pristi*, the Propriety of the words, *in these wordes, This is my Body, but the Papisticall Transubstantiation must be esta-*

(98) *In l. Epist. Oecolampad. and Zwing. Ep. ad Frideric. cum. p. 243.*
(99) *Loc. com. c. de Cœna p. 312.*
(100) *Gal. 3. 15.*
(101) *Collat. Cath. & orth. fidei &c. p. 321. n. 39.*
(*) *Apud Schusselb. l. 4. Theol. Calu. art. 9. p. 144.* And see the like in Resp. *ad Billicanum.* To. 2. *fol. 163.*
(102) *In Explan. Art. 28.*
(103) *In Admon. vlt. ad Westph. p. 812.*
(104) *Ad Repetit. Santis. p. 8.*
(105) *De cœn. cont. Westphal. in Tract. Theol. p. 216.*

eſtablished. Chamierus repeateth and alloweth this laſt ſaying of Beza for moſt true, ſaying, (106) *I acknowledge my Maiſter his ſpeach to be moſt true.* The Deuines of Geneua profeſſe to beleeue, that, (107) *If the wordes of Chriſt be to be taken ſimply, it is neceſſary that the damage* (ſo are heretickes pleaſed to terme it) *of Tranſubſtantiation muſt infallibly follow.* D. Reinolds is inforced to ſay, (108) *I will grant the wordes of Chriſt, This is my Body, in ſhew rather to fauour your Reall Preſence, then that Sacrament all which we defend.* So confeſſedly cleere are the ſacred Scriptures taken in their literall ſenſe, for the Reall Preſence and Tranſubſtantiation.

(106) Epiſt. Ieſuit. part. 2. p. 49. 16.
(107) Apol. Modeſt. &c. p. 18.
(108) In his Conf. c. 2. ſect. 2. p. 23.

SECT. V.

That the Ancient Fathers do expound the Scriptures in proofe of our Catholicke Doctrine of the Reall Preſence and Tranſubſtantiation.

THe Ancient Fathers are no leſſe cleere in their Interpretations: ſo S. Iuſtin Martyr writing herof, ſaith, (1) *This nourishment is called amongſt vs the Euchariſte, the which is lawfull for no other to receiue, then he who beleeueth our Doctrine to be true, and is waſhed with the Lauer for remiſſion of ſinnes, and regeneration, euen as Chriſt hath giuen it to the liuing. For we do not receiue theſe Elements, as common bread, nor as common drinke; but euen as Chriſt our Sauiour was made flesh by the word of God, and had flesh and blood to procure our Saluation. After the ſame manner alſo, we haue bene taught, that, that nourishment, wherin thankes are giuen, by the prayers of his word proceading from him, is the flesh and blood of that incarnated Ieſus, wherevpon our blood and flesh are nourished by mutation. For the Apoſtles in their Commentaries, left written by them, which are called the Goſpell, haue ſo deliuered, that Ieſus commanded them, for that he taking bread, when he had giuen thanks, did ſay, do you this in remembrance of me, This is my Body. And the Cup likewiſe being taken, and thankes being giuen, to haue ſaid, This is my Blood.* The Centuriſtes ſpeaking of Iuſtin and Irenæus, ſay, (2) *Neither did they thinke Bread and wine to be only naked figures of the*

(1) In Apologia. 2. ad Antonium.
(2) Cent. 2. Col. 48.

the Body and bloud of Chriſte &c. They taught according to the word and inſtitution of Chriſt himſelfe, with bread and wine the fleſh and bloud of Chriſt Incarnate to be diſtributed, as the place of Iuſtine doth plainly teſtify, in Apol. 2. So confeſſedly are theſe two Ancients for the reall Preſence.

Origen comparing the former figures with our truthes, ſaith, (3) *In former tymes Baptiſme was in obſcurity in the Cloud & in the Sea, now Regeneration is in kind, in water and the holy Ghoſt: then obſcurely Manna was the food, but now, in forme, the fleſh of the word of God is the true food: euen as he ſaith, becauſe my fleſh is truly meate, and my bloud is truly drinke.* And in (4) another place, *Seeing the drinking of bloud is forbidden by God with ſo ſtrong Commandes, what people is this that vſeth to drink bloud?* To this he anſweareth, *But Chriſtian people, a faithfull people, beareth and imbraceth theſe thinges, and followeth him who ſayth,* (5) *Vnles you ſhall eate my fleſh and drinke my bloud, you ſhall not haue lyfe in you: becauſe my fleſh is truly meate, and my bloud is truly drinke.* And the ſame Origen elswhere to the like effect affirmeth, (6) *When thou receiueſt the holy foode, and that incorruptible banquet, when thou doſt enioy the bread and Cup of lyfe, thou doſt eate and drinke the Body and Bloud of our Lord, then our Lord entreth vnder thy roofe: and therfore then humbling thy ſelfe, imitate this Centurion, and ſay, O Lord I am not worthy that thou ſhouldeſt enter vnder the roofe of my houſe: for where he entreth vnworthily, there he entreth to iudge, and punish the receiuer.* The Prot. Scultetus acknowledgeth that, (7) *The Centuriſtes of Magdeburge c.* 10. *cent.* 3. *do aſcribe to Origen the erroneous doctrine of Conſubſtantiation.*

(3) *Ho.* 7. *in Numer.*

(4) *Ho.* 16. *in Num.*

(5) Io. 6. 54.

(6) *Ho.* 5. *in diuerſis.*

(7) *Medulla Theol. p.* 192.

Magnes alſo another Greeke Father, and very ancient, liuing in the age 350. teacheth the ſame doctrine, ſaying, (8) *If therfore the earth be affirmed of the Body, (that is, if the Body be called Earth) in reguard of the ancient origine, and the Earth was Chriſtes owne and proper Creature, by reaſon of Creation, and of this Earth Bread and wyne hath come, of it (to wit Bread) the body of man hath bene made againe, and this Body Chriſt hath put on worthily, iuſtly, deſeruedly, when he tooke Bread and wyne he hath ſaid, This is my Body &c. For it is not a figure of his Body or bloud, as ſome by a ſtupid and ſenſeles Expoſition haue tryfled, but rather truly the Body & Bloud of Chriſte &c.*

(8) *Ad Theoſtbenem. l.* 3.

But who can speake more plainly then S. Cyrill of Hierusalem? (9) *When then Christ himselfe doth thus affirme and say of Bread, This is my Body, who euer hereafter dare doubt? and the same Christ also confirming and saying, This is my blood, who I say, may doubt, and say, there is not his blood? In tymes past he changed water into wyne, which is neere to blood, in Cana of Galilee, by his only will, and shall he not be worthy whom we may beleeue, that by transmutation, he turned wyne into his blood? For if being inuited to corporall Mariages he wrought a stupendious Miracle, shall we not much more confesse him to haue giuen his body, and his Blood to the Children of the spouse? Wherfore with all certainty and assurance let vs receiue the Body and Blood of Christ, for vnder the forme of Bread, there is giuen thee the Body, and vnder the forme of wyne, his blood is giuen thee, that receiuing the body and blood of Christ, thou mayest be made vnto him compartner of his body and blood: χριστόφοροι γινόμεθα, we shalbe made bearers of Christ, when we haue receiued his body & blood into our Members, and so, as Peter saith, we shalbe made partakers of the diuine nature &c. Knowing this, and boulding it for most certaine, that this bread which is seene of vs, is not bread, although the tast perceiue it to be bread, but that it is the body of Christ: and the wyne which is seene of vs, although to the sense of taste it seeme to be wyne, yet it is not wyne, but the blood of Christ.* And in another place, (10) *Do not doubt whether this be true, be manifestly saying, This is my Body.* So manifest are Christs wordes, & S. Cyrils Exposition for the Reall Presence, and Transubstantiation.

(9) Catech. 4. Mystag.

(10) Ad Calosyrium.

S. Chrysostome also to the like effect sayth, (11) *Let vs therfore euery where beleeue God, neither let vs gainsay him, although it seeme absurd to sense, and our cogitation, that which he speaketh; his word surmounts both sense and our reason: what we do in all thinges, but especially in the mysteries, let vs do it, not looking vpon those thinges only which lye before vs, but also beholding his wordes, for we cannot be deceiued by his wordes, but our sense is most apt to be deceyued: his wordes cannot be false, this sense is often and often deceiued: therfore because he said it, This is my body, let vs not doubt, but beleeue, and let vs behould it with the eies of our vnderstanding, for no sensible thing is giuen vnto vs by Christe, but by thinges indeed sensible: but all things which he deliuered are insensible. So also in Bap-*

(11) Ho. 83. ex. c. 26. Mat.

tisme

tiſme by water which is a ſenſible thing, that guift is granted: but that which is done therin, to wit, the regeneration and renouation, is a certaine thing to be conceyued, for if thou were incorporeall, he had giuen vnto thee barely thoſe incorporeall guiftes: but becauſe thy ſoule is conioyned to a Body in ſenſible thinges, thinges intellectuall, or to be vnderſtood, are deliuered vnto thee. O how many do now ſay, I would ſee his forme and ſhape, his garmentes, his ſhooes: him therfore thou ſeeſt, him thou touchest, him thou eateſt &c. theſe workes are not of humane power, which Chriſt wrought in that ſupper: he alſo doth now worke, he doth perfect: we hould the Office and order of miniſters, but it is he who truly ſanctifyeth, and by tranſmutation altereth. I will rather giue my lyfe, then I will giue our Lordes Body to any one vnworthily, I will rather ſuffer my bloud to be ſhed, then deliuer that ſacred bloud, except to a worthy perſon. Againe, (12) There was ſometimes a Paſche of the Iewes but it is abrogated, and made voyd by the comming of the ſpirituall Paſche, which Chriſt deliuered, for when they did eate (ſayth he) & drinke, he tooke bread, & brake, & ſaid, This is my Body which ſhalbe giuẽ for you &c. And againe, he tooke the Chalice & ſaid, This is my bloud which ſhalbe ſhed for many to remiſſion of ſinnes. And Iudas was preſent whẽ Chriſt ſpake theſe words, This is the bloud: Speake Iudas, This is the Bloud which thou ſouldeſt for 30. pence, for which before thou bargaynedſt with the Phariſees? O mercy of Chriſt, O madnes of Iudas! who couenanted to ſell him for 30. pence, and Chriſt offereth to him the bloud which he hath ſould, that he might haue forginenes of ſinnes, if ſo be it he would not be wicked, for Iudas was preſent, and made partaker of that Sacrifice. And expounding thoſe words of the Apoſtle, (13) The Chalice of Benediction which we do bleſſe, is it not the Communication of the Bloud of Chriſt, he ſayth: the meaning of theſe (wordes) is this, that which is in the Chalice, is that which flowed from his ſyde, and we are partakers of it. The Centuriſtes cyte many particular ſayings of S. Chryſoſtome wherein, ſay they, (14) He ſeemeth to confirme Tranſubſtantiation. But he is ſo farre from only ſeeming, that moſt directly he teacheth Real Preſence, Tranſubſtantiation, Iudas his receiuing the Bloud, the Sacrifice at the laſt Supper, & that theſe things are to be beleiued, though they ſeeme abſurd to ſenſe and reaſon.

(12) Hom. de prodit. Iudæ. quæ eſt Tom. 1.

(13) 1. Cor. 10. 16.

(14) Cent. 5. c. 4. Col. 537.

S. Cyrill of Alexandria ſecureth vs of this truth, ſay-

ing. (15) Neyther doubt thou whether this be true, be plainly saying: This is my Body, but rather receiue & beleeue the words of our Sauiour, for whereas he is the Truth, he doth not lye: they are mad therefore, who say that the mysticall Benediction doth cease from sanctification, if any relickes thereof remaine to the next day: for the most holy Body of Christ shall not be changed, but the vertue of Benediction, & the quickning grace is euerlasting in it; for the quickning vertue is the only begotten word of God the Father, which was made flesh, not ceasing to be the word, but making the flesh quickning &c. It did therefore beseeme him to be in some sort vnited to our bodyes, by his holy flesh and precious bloud, which we receyue in the quickning Benediction in bread and wine: for least we should abhorre flesh and bloud, put vpon the Sacred Altars, God descending to our frailties, doth infuse to the things offered the power of lyfe, turning and converting them into the truth of his owne flesh, that the body of lyfe as a certayne quickning seed, may be found in vs. Whereupon he addeth, Do this in remembrance of me. S. Cyril is so playne heerein, that Peter Martyr sayth, (16) I will not so easily subscribe to Cyril, who affirmed such a Communion as thereby euen the substance of the flesh and bloud of Christ is ioyned to the blessing.

(15) Ep. ad Calosyrium.

(16) In his Ep. to Beza annexed to his Com. Pla. p. 106.

S. Iohn Damascene proueth the same thus, (17) Wherefore if the word of God be liuely and efficacious, and our Lord did all whatsoeuer he would; If he said, Let there be light, and light was made, Let there be a firmament, and it was made: if the heauens were established by the ward of God, and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth; If heauen and Earth, the water also and fyre, and aire, and all the ornamentes of them, were made complete and accomplished, and moreouer this noblest Creature called Man: If God himselfe the word, since so it was his will became man, and framed to himselfe flesh, without humane seede, of the pure and immaculate bloud of the holy and euer Virgin, what can at last be alleadged, but that of Bread he cā make his Body, of wyne and water he can make his bloud? He spake of old, Let the Earth bring forth the greene herbe, and she produced, inforced, and strengthened by his diuine precept, her fruite and buddes, when as yet there was no raine. God said, This is my Body, This is my bloud &c. this do you in remembrance of me, and by his Omnipotent Commandement this is done till he come (for he vsed these wordes, till he come) and the raine for this new Corne is the ouershadowing vertue of the

(17) Orthodoxa fidei, c. 14.

the holy Ghoſt: for as whatſoeuer God made, he made it by the power of the holy Ghoſt, in like manner now alſo the working of the ſpirit doth effect thoſe thinges which ſurmount nature, and which cannot be comprehended or vnderſtood but by only faith. After what manner, ſaid the Virgin, ſhall this be done, demanded the holy Virgin, becauſe I know not man? The Archangell Gabriel anſwered, The holy Ghoſt ſhall come vpon thee, and the power of the higheſt ſhall ouerſhadow thee. Thou alſo now demaundeſt, how bread and wyne mixt with water, is made the Body and blood of Chriſt? And I in like manner anſwere thee: the holy ſpirit commeth vpon, and maketh them, which thinges ſo made, exceed all abilitie of ſpeech and vnderſtanding of the mynd. Moreouer bread and wyne are therfore vſed, becauſe humane imbecillity is well knowne and manifeſted to God; becauſe for the moſt part it is auerſe, and cannot endure but thinges common by Cuſtome. Hence it commeth to paſſe, that God for his accuſtomed Indulgence towards vs, worketh thoſe thinges which ſurmount nature by thinges vſuall & familiar to nature. And euen as he hath therfore coupled the Grace of the holy Ghoſt in Baptiſme with oyle & water, & hath made it the Lauer of regeneration, becauſe it is vſuall amongſt men to be waſhed with water, and annointed with oyle: in the ſame maner, becauſe the vſe and cuſtome of men, doth ſo beare it that men eate bread, and drinke wyne and water, therfore he hath ioyned his diuinity with theſe, and hath made them his Body and his Blood, that by thinges vſuall and agreable to nature, we may aryſe to ſupernaturall things. Doubtles the body truly vnited to the Diuinity, is that body which was borne of the holy Virgin, not that, that Body was aſſumed of the heauen and deſcended, but becauſe the very Bread and wyne are changed into the Body and blood of God. But if thou require how it be done, let it ſuffice thee to heare, that it is done by the holy Ghoſt, as our Lord alſo framed to himſelfe, and in himſelfe flesh of the holy Mother of God by the holy Ghoſt. Neyther any more is knowne and ſearched out of vs, then that the word of God is true and efficacious and omnipotent, for the manner is ſuch, that no reaſon can ſearch it out. Moreouer let it not ſeeme ſtrange to ſay this alſo, that men as Bread by way of foode, and wyne and water by way of drinke are changed into the Body and Blood of the eater and drinker, and become another body, and diuerſe from the body they were: So the bread of Propoſition, and the wyne and water by inuocation of the holy Spirit and his comming, are turned into the Body and Blood of Chriſt after

ter

ter an admirable manner, neyther are they two, but one and the same. Neyther truly are bread and wyne the figure of Christs Body (for be this farre from vs to say) but the very selfesame body of our Lord, qualifyed with his Diuinity: because where our Lord himselfe hath sayd; this is not a signe of a body, but a Body: nor a signe of blood, but blood &c. That S. Damascene taught Transubstantiation, it is acknowledged, and disliked by many (18) Protestants.

(18) Carlile that Christ descended not into Hell. fol. 58. Occolamp. in Epist. l 3. p. 661. Whitak. cont. Duraum, p. 238. Chemnit. Exam. part. 2. p. 84. 90.

To come to the Latin Fathers, S. Cyprian writing purposely of this point, speaketh thus, (19) *This bread which our Lord did reach vnto his Disciples, changed not in forme or figure, but in nature, became flesh by the Omnipotency of the word: and euen as in the person of Christ the humanity was seene, and the Diuinity lay hid; so the Essence infuseth it selfe after an vnspeakable manner into the visible Sacrament &c.* Agayne, (20) *They had eaten and drunken of the same bread according to the visible forme, but before those words, that common bread was only fit to nourish the body &c. but after it was sayd by our Lord, Do this in Commemoration of me, this is my flesh, and this is my blood, as often as it is done with these words, and this sayth, that substantiall bread and Cup, consecrated with solemne Benediction, profiteth to the lyfe & saluation of the whole man, being both a medicine and holocaust to cure Infirmities, and to take away sinnes. The difference also of spirituall and corporall meate is made manifest, that it was one thing which at first was set before them and eaten, another which was giuen and distributed by our mayster.* And in another place of the same Sermon he saith, *The Doctrine of this Sacrament is new, and the Euangelicall Schooles brought forth this first Maistership (or teaching,) and Christ being the Maister, this Doctrine was first made knowne vnto the world, that Christians should drinke Blood, the eating whereof the authority of the old Law doth most strictly forbid: for the law forbiddeth eating of blood, the Ghospell commandeth that it be drunke.* S. Cyprian is so cleere, that the Prot. Vrsinus confesseth that, (21) *Many things are spoken by Cyprian, which seeme to establish Transubstantiation.*

(19) De cœna Domini.

(20) De cœna Dom. propè init.

(21) Commune factio &c.

With S. Cyprian agreeth S. Hilary, writing thus, (22) *If the word be truly made flesh, and we truly receiue the word made flesh in our Lordes food, how is not Christ thought naturally to abyde in vs who now bo'ne man, both assumed vnto himselfe the inseparable nature of our flesh, and also hath ioyned the nature of his flesh, to the nature*

(22) Lib. 8. de Trinitate.

ture of Eternity, vnder the Sacrament of Communicating his flesh vnto vs? For ſo we are all one, becauſe the Father is in Chriſt, and Chriſt is in vs &c. Touching the naturall truth of Chriſt in vs, what thinges *we ſpeake, vnles we learne of him, we ſpeake foolishly and wickedly. For he ſaith, My flesh is truly meate, and my Bloud is truly drinke; he that eateth my flesh and drinketh my bloud, abydeth in me, and I in him.* Touching the verity of his flesh and bloud, *there is left no place of doubting, for now both by Confeſsion of our Lord himſelfe, and by our faith, it is truly flesh, and it is truly bloud: and theſe being receiued and drunken, do worke that thing, that both we are in Chriſt, and Chriſt in vs: what is not this verity it ſelfe? Therfore he is in vs by his flesh & we are in him whileſt this which we are is with him in God: And that we are in him by the Sacrament of his flesh and bloud, communicated, he witneſſeth ſaying. And this world now ſeeth me not, but you ſhall ſee me, becauſe I liue, and you ſhall liue, becauſe I am in the Father, and you in me and I in you.* S. Hilary is ſo plaine in this, that Caluin profeſſeth (23) *He will not ſubſcribe vnto him.*

(21) *L. Epiſt. &c ep. 208. 392.*

(24) *De iis qui miſterijs initiantur, c. 9.*

But who can ſpeake more cleerly then Saint Ambroſe doth in theſe wordes (24) *Peraduenture thou mayeſt ſay, I ſee another thing, how doſt do affirme vnto me, that I receiue the body of Chriſt? and yet this remayneth vnto vs to proue: how great examples therfore do we vſe? We proue that it is not that which nature framed, but what Benediction conſecrated; and that greater is the power of Benediction then of Nature, becauſe by Benediction Nature it ſelfe is changed. Moyſes held a rod, he caſt it from him, and it became a ſerpent &c.* And after he had tould many other miracles of Moyſes, Elias, and Eliſeus, he concludeth: *But if humane Benediction were of ſuch power, that it could conuert Nature, what do we ſay of the very diuine Conſecration, where the words of our Lord & Sauiour worke? For this Sacrament which thou doſt receiue is made by the word of Chriſt: but if the word of Elias was ſo potent, that it could call for fyre from heauen, ſhall not the word of Chriſt be of ſo much power, that it may change the formes of Elements? of the workes of the whole (world) thou haſt read: Becauſe he ſpake, and thinges were made, he commanded and they were created. Therfore the word of Chriſt which could make of nothing the thing that was not, can it not change the thinges which be into that which they were not? for it is no leſſe to giue new natures to thinges, then to change natures &c Our*

Lord Ieſus cryeth out. This is my Body, before the Benediction of the heauenly wordes another forme is named (ſe meaneth Bread) after Conſecration the Body of Chriſt is notified: he calleth it his bloud, before Conſecration it is called another thing, after Conſecration it is named the Bloud of Chriſt. And thou ſaieſt Amen, that is, it is true: What the mouth ſpeaketh, the inward mynd acknowledgeth &c. It is euident, that beſides the order of nature a Virgin brought forth, and this Body which we make, is of the Virgin: why doſt thou ſeeke here the order of nature in the Body of Chriſt, whereas beſydes nature the Lord Ieſus was borne of a Virgin? And the ſame S. Ambroſe elſwhere goeth yet further, and ſayth, (25) Peraduenture thou ſayeſt, My bread is vſuall Bread, but this bread is bread before the wordes of the Sacraments, when Conſecration ſhall come, of bread is made the flesh of Chriſt. This therfore we affirme, how can that which is bread become the body of Chriſt? by Conſecration. Conſecration therfore with whoſe words, and with whoſe ſpeaches? of our Lord Ieſus Chriſt. For all other things which are ſaid, praiſe is giuen to God, ſupplication is made for the people, for kings, for others: but when it is come, that the Veneruable Sacrament muſt be made, now the Prieſt doth not vſe his owne wordes, but he vſeth the wordes of Chriſt. Therfore the word of Chriſt doth make this Sacrament. What word of Chriſt? to wit, that, wherby all thinges were made. Our Lord commanded and heauen was made: Our Lord commanded, and the Earth was made: Our Lord commanded and the ſeas were made; Our Lord commanded and euery Creature was made. Thou ſeeſt therfore how powerfull in operation Chriſts word is! If therfore there be ſo great power in the word of our Lord Ieſus, that thinges which were not begunne, to haue being; how much more is it able in operation to cauſe that thinges which were, ſhould be, and be changed into another thing? heauen was not, Sea was not, Earth was not, but heare one ſaying, (26) He ſpake, and thinges were made, he commanded, and they were created. Therfore that I may anſwere thee, There was not the Body of Chriſt before Conſecration, but after Conſecration I ſay vnto thee, that there is now the Body of Chriſt &c. therfore thou haſt learned, that of Bread there is made the Body of Chriſt, and that wyne and water is put into the Chalice, but it is made bloud by the Conſecration of the heauenly word but peraduenture thou ſayeſt, I ſee not the forme of bloud but it hath the ſimilitude, for as thou haſt taken the ſimilitude of his death, ſo alſo thou drinkeſt

(25) L. 4. de Sacram. c. 4.

(26) Pſ. 148. 5.

drinkeſt the ſimilitude of his precious Bloud, that there may be no horrour of his Bloud, & yet it worketh the price of Redemption. Thou haſt learned therfore that, that which thou receiueſt, is the Body of Chriſt.

And elswhere he concludeth, (27) *Before it be conſecrated, it is but bread, but when the words of Conſecration come, it is the Body of Chriſt. To conclude, Heare him ſaying, Take and eate of it all, for this is my Body: and before the words of Chriſt, the Chalice is full of wyne and water; when the wordes of Chriſt haue wrought, there it is made Bloud, which redeemed the people: Therfore marke you in how great maiſters the word of Chriſt is potent to conuert all things. Moreouer our very Lord Ieſus teſtifyeth vnto vs that we receyue his Body and Bloud: what ought we to doubt of his fidelity, and Teſtimony?* Agayne, expounding thoſe words of the Pſalmiſt, (28) *Adore yee the footeſtoole of his feete, he* ſaith, (29) *It is no ſmall queſtion, and therefore let vs conſider more diligently, what is the footeſtoole: for we read elswhere,* (30) *Heauen is my Throne, but the Earth the footſtoole of my feete. But neyther are we to adore the Earth, becauſe it is a Creature of God: yet let vs ſee if the Prophet doth not affirme that earth to be adored, which our Lord Ieſus tooke in the Aſſumption of flesh. Therfore by the footeſtoole, the Earth may be vnderſtood, but by the Earth the fleſh of Chriſt, which at this day we alſo adore in the Myſteries, and which the Apoſtles adored in our Lord Ieſus &c.* And the like expoſition heerof is giuen by S. Hierome, (31) who alſo further ſayth, (32) *There is as great difference betweene the Bread of Propoſition and the Body of Chriſt, as betweene a ſhadow and bodyes, betweene an Image and the truth, betweene patternes of things to come, and the things themſelues which are prefigured by theſe patternes.* S. Ambroſe is ſo cleer for the Real Preſence, that he is therefore reproued by (33) ſundry Proteſtants.

Gaudentius alſo a very Ancient Father, liuing in the yeare 400. writeth to like effect, ſaying: (34) *The ſame throughout the ſeuerall howſes of the Churches being offered in the Miſtery of Bread and wyne, doth reuiue being beleiued, doth quicken being Conſecrated, doth ſanctify ſuch as Conſecrate. This is the fleſh of the Lambe, this is the Bloud, for the bread which came downe from heauen doth ſay, The bread which I will giue, is my fleſh, for the life of*

(27) L. 4. de Sacram. c. 5.

(28) Pſ. 98. 5.
(29) L. 1. de Spir. ſanct. c. 12.
(30) Iſa. 66. 1.

(31) In pſ. 98.
(32) In Tit. 1.
(33) Oecolamp. in l. Epiſt. Oecolamp. & c. l. 3. p. 730 & Cent. 4. c. 4. Col. 105. Melanct. lo. p. 630. Luther. l. cont. Regem Anglia.

(34) Tract. 2. de Exod.

» the world: with good reaſon and very aptly euen then is
» bloud expreſſed vnder the forme of wyne, becauſe where he
» ſayth in the Ghoſpell, I am the true vine, he doth ſufficient-
» ly declare, that all wine which is offered in the figure of his
» Paſſion, is his bloud. Whereupon the moſt B. Patriarch Iacob
» propheſied of Chriſte, ſaying: He ſhall waſh his ſtole in
» wyne, and in the bloud of the Grape his cloake; becauſe he
» was to waſh the cloathing of our Body with his owne pro-
» per Bloud. He therfore the Creator and Lord of Natures,
» who brought bread forth of the Earth, and againe of Bread
» (becauſe he both can, and hath promiſed) doth make his
» owne Body: and he who made wyne of water, and of wine
» his bloud &c. O depth of the riches of the wiſdome and
» knowledge of God! It is the Paſche of our Lord, that is, Our
» Lords Paſſe-ouer. Eſteeme it not terrene, which is made
» heauenly by him who paſſeth into it, and made it of his Bo-
» dy and bloud &c. Belieue thou muſt that which is denoun-
» ced and ſpoken, becauſe that which thou receiueſt is the Bo-
» dy of that heauenly Bread, & the bloud of that ſacred vyne:
» for when he taught and gaue the Conſecrated Bread and
» wyne to his Diſciples, he thus ſpake; This is my Body. This
» is my Bloud. Let vs belieue him whom we haue belieued,
» truth cannot lye &c. let vs not infringe that moſt ſolid word
» of his mouth. This is my Body, This is my Bloud. But if
» any thing euen now in any mans opinion or vnderſtan-
» ding remayne, which he hath not cõprehended in this Ex-
» poſition, let the flame of a fiery faith conſume it.

(35) Conc. 1. in Pſ. 33.

S. Auſtine expounding the title of the Pſalme in which it is written, *And he was caryed in his owne hands*, ſayth, (35) *Brethren who can vnderſtand how this could be done in man? For who is caryed in his owne hands? A man may be caryed in the hands of another, in his owne hands no man is caryed. How this may be vnderſtood in Dauid himſelfe, according to the letter, we fynd not, but in Chriſt we fynd. For Chriſt was caryed in his owne hands, when commending his owne Body, he ſayd, This is my Body: for he carryed that Body in his hands.* This place is ſo vnanſwerable that Hoſpinian vndertaking to ſet downe, (36) *The Hyperbolicall phraſes of the Fathers*, doth among others, for ſuch place

(36) Hiſt. Sacram. part. 2. l. 4. p. 292. 293.

this

this saying of S. Austine. In like sort commenting vpon these wordes, *Adore ye the footstoole of his feete because it is holy*, he saith, (37) *What are we to adore? The footstoole of his feet &c. But Brethren consider what he commandeth vs to adore. In another place the Scripture sayth*, (38) *Heauen is my seat, and the Earth my footstoole. Therfore he commandeth vs to adore the Earth, because he said in another place, that it was the footstoole of God? And how shal we adore the Earth, seeing the Scripture saith plainly*, (39) *Thou shalt adore the Lord thy God; And here he saith, Adore ye the footstoole of his feete? And expounding to me, what is the footstoole of his feete he saith, The Earth is the footstoole of my feete. I am become staggering, I feare to adore the Earth, least he damne me, who hath made the heauen and Earth. Againe, I feare not to adore the footstoole of my Lords feete, because the psalme saith to me, Adore yee the footstoole of his feete &c. Wauering, I turne my selfe to Christ, because I seeke him heere, and I fynd how without impiety the Earth may be adored; without impiety the footstoole of his feete may be adored: for he tooke earth of earth, because flesh is of Earth, and he tooke flesh of the flesh of Mary: And because he walked here in his flesh, and gaue to vs his flesh to be eaten to Saluation: now no man eateth that flesh, but first adoreth it. It is found out how such a footstoole of our Lords feet may be adored, and that we shall not only not sinne by adoring, but sinne by not adoring.* Now wheras Bilson answereth herto that, (40) *It is eaten with the spirit, adored with the spirit, yea the very eating of it, is the adoring of it*, S. Austine directly to the contrary distinguisheth eating from adoring, and maketh, as we do, adoring in priority to eating: and this adoring not to be only in spirit, but by externall bowing downe and prosternation. Lastly sayth S. Austine, (41) *Receiue this in Bread, which hunge vpon the Crosse; Receiue this in the Chalice, which flowed from the syde of Christ*. S. Austine is so cleere herin, that Bucer sayth, (42) *How often doth Austine write that euen Iudas receiued the very Body and Bloud of our Lord.* (43) *And Austine writeth in many places, that the Body and Bloud of our Lord, is to be honoured and receiued in the visible signes.* Hospinian confesseth S. Austine to say, (44) *We do truly honour in the forme of Bread and wyne which we see, things inuisible, that is to say, flesh and bloud*. So cleere and confessed is S. Austine for the reall Presence of Christes Body and Bloud in

(37) *In psl.* 98.
(38) *Isa.* 66. 1.
(39) *Deut.* 6. 13. *Mat.* 4. 11.
(40) True difference part. 4. p. 336.
(41) *Ser. ad Neophitos.*
(42) *Scripta Anglic. p.* 678.
(43) *Ibid. p.* 678.
(44) *Hist. Sacram. part.* 2. *l.* 3. *p.* 331.

the Sacrament, and our Adoration therof.

Eucherius of Lyons his wholesome aduise and doctrine is this: (45) Let all doubtfull infidelity depart, since he who is the authour of the guift, he also is the witnesse of the truth; for the inuisible Priest doth by his word and secret power conuert the visible creatures, into the substance of his Body and Bloud, saying thus, Take yee, eate yee, for this is my Body. And the sanctification being reiterated; receiue and drinke, This is my Bloud. Therefore as at the becke of our Lords commanding, immediatly the highest heauens, the deepest waters, the vastnes of the earth subsisted, with like power, the vertue of the word doth command in spiritual Sacraments, and the effect obeyeth. Nor let any man doubt, that the primary Creatures at the becke of this power, by the presence of his Maiesty may passe ouer into the nature of our Lords Body, when he seeth man himself made the body of Christ by the workemãship of heauenly mercy: and as he who beleiuing before the words of Baptisme, is yet in the Bond of his old debt, but the words of Baptisme once sayd, presently he is freed from all degres of sinne: euen so when the Creatures blessed with the heauẽly wordes, are put vpon the sacred Aultars, before they are consecrated by the Inuocation of the supreme Deity, there is the substance of Bread and wine; but after the words of Christ, it is the Body and Bloud of Christ. And what meruaile is it, if he can conuert things created, which he could create by his word? Yea now it seemeth to be a lesse miracle, if that which he is knowne to haue made of nothing, being now created, he be yet able to change into a better thing.

(45) Ho. 5. de Pascha.

In like sort S. Leo aduiseth, (46) *Because our Lord saith, except you eate the flesh &c. let vs so communicate, that we nothing doubt of the truth of Christs Body and bloud: for that is receiued with mouth, which is beleiued in hart.*

(46) Ser. 6. de ieiun. 7. mens.

The Fathers do so confessedly agree with Catholickes heerein, that it is acknowledged by Prot. themselues, (47) *That, Gregory the great taught Transubstantiation*: that, (48) *Chrysostome is thought to confirme Transubstantiation*: that, (49) *The Bookes of Sacraments ascribed to Ambrose, assume the opinion of Christs*

(47) Humfr. Iesi. part. 2. rat. 5.
(48) Cent. 5. Col. 517.
(49) Antony de Ada-

Christs bodily presence in the Sacrament: That, S. Ignatius sayd of the heretickes of his tyme. (50) *They do not admit Eucharists and oblations, because they do not confesse the Eucharists to be the flesh of our Saviour Iesus-Christ, which flesh suffered for our sinnes*: (51) That, *Transubstantiation entred early into the Church*: And that, (52) *they have not yet hitherto beene able to know when this opinion of the Real and bodily being of Christ in the Sacrament did first beginne*. So confessedly most ancient is the doctrine of Real Presence and Transubstantiation: and so cleerely are the sacred Scriptures expounded in proofe thereof by the learned and holy Fathers, both Greeke and Latine.

(50) Theodoret. dial. 3. Hamelm. de Trad. Apost. Col. 746. Chemnit. Ex. part 2. p. 94.

(51) Adam Francisci in Marg. Theol. p. 256.

(52) Ant. de Adamo Anatomy of Masse. p. 230.

SECT. VI.

That Protestant wryters do teach and believe from Scriptures, the Real Presence of Christes Body and Bloud in the Eucharist.

TO examine now what sundry Prot. teach and believe concerning the Reall Presence; and first to beginne with the Hussites, Iohn Husse himselfe prescribeth that, (1) *Whatsoever Christ Iesus delivered by himselfe to his Apostles, and by them and other holy Doctours; and whatsoever his holy Roman Church holdeth of this Venerable Sacrament, that firmely is to be believed &c. By power & institution of Christ &c. by the ministery of Priestes, his true Body is in the venerable Sacrament, which was conceived and borne of the most chast Virgin Mary &c. Likewise the bloud which was shed upon the Crosse in remission of sinnes out of the same Body*. And now for *Transubstantiation*, saith he (2) *the Sonne of God &c. with his word by Transubstantiation maketh true Bread, flesh, and wyne by Transubstantiation is made bloud*. Lastly for Adoration he telleth his owne practise saying. (3) *We adore the Body and bloud of Christ being at the right hand of God the Father, and hid in the venerable Sacrament which Priestes make and so we know what we adore*. Againe, (4) *The Eucharist is more to be worshipped by the faithfull, then the reliques of other Saintes*.

(1) L. de cœna Domini. c. 2.

(2) Cap. 3.

(3) Tract. de omni Sanguine Christi glorificato.

(4) Contra Bullam Papæ de Electione Crucis.

Perzibrane another Hussite declareth the vnanimous consent of the Hussites in this point, saying, (5) *I truly profesſe,*

(1) Cap. 21.

ſeſſe, that aboue 20. yeares agoe M. Iohn Huſſe, with the Maiſters & Doctors of the Country of Bohemia, by their full Counſell, and vnanimous Conſent, none, as they ſaid contradicting haue reiected, and confuted, and prohibited publickly thoſe Articles of Wiccliffe, to wit, that materiall bread remayneth in the hoſtie after Conſecration: alſo that in the Sacraments, Accidents do not ſtand without their ſubiect: Alſo that Chriſt is not in the ſame Sacrament identically, and really.

We need not doubt to fynd the Lutheranes fully ioyning with vs in the reall Preſence. Luther wrote a ſpeciall booke, entituled, (6) *Defenſio verborum Cœnæ Accipite, comedite, Hoc eſt corpus meum: contra fanaticos Sacramentariorum ſpiritus*, wherin he auoucheth that, (7) *The Deuill with blaſpheming the Supper of our Lord Ieſus Chriſt doth aſſault vs at this day by fanaticall men, who dreame that there is giuen only Bread and wyne in ſigne or ſymboll of Chriſtian profeſſion neither will they grant that the Body and bloud of Chriſt is there, when as the wordes are moſt expreſſe and cleere, Eate ye, this is my Body &c. nothing doth more promote this hereſy, then nouelty &c. I cannot perſwade my ſelfe, that this hereſy will long continue: for it is very groſſe and immoderate, and it doth not impugne doubtfull opinions, and doubtfull Teſtimonies of Scripture, but plaine and expreſſe ſentences of Scripture.* Againe, *I will take God to witnes, and the whole world, and I will confeſſe, that I will not be of opinion with the Sacramentaries, nor neuer was, nor world without end, God willing, wilbe. And I will haue my handes cleane from the bloud of all thoſe, whoſe ſoules by this poyſon they dryue from Chriſt, they ſeduce and kill &c. And I would friendly and familiar intreat them, that they would not be angry at me for this, that I condemne their doctrine, and aſcribe it to the Deuill: For I cannot do, or ſpeake otherwiſe, then I beare in my hart and beleeue.* And ſome pages after, *Doctor Caroloſtadius of theſe ſacred wordes, This is my Body, doth pitifully wreſt the Pronowne, This. Zwinglius vexeth the Verbe ſubſtantiue, Is. Oecolampadius putteth the Nown, Body, vpon the torture, others teare in peeces the whole texte &c. Theſe tread vnderfoote and deſtroy all thinges: and yet the holy Ghoſt is in euery one of theſe, and none will be reproued of Errour &c. So groſſly and cleerly doth the Deuill take vs by the noſe.* Againe, *This is worthy of admiration, that none of the Fathers, who are infinite in number, do ſo ſpeake of the Sacrament, as the Sacramentaries do.* And in another place he writeth

(6) Extat. tom. 7.
(7) poſt init.

teth thus Catholickly, (8) *In the Sacrament of the Aultar it is not Bread and wyne, but the formes of bread and wyne: for bread is changed into the true and naturall Body of Christ, and wyne into the true and naturall Blood of Christ.*

But this Doctrine of Reall Preſence is ſo cleerly taught by Luther, that Prot. confeſſe, that he maintayneth (9) *Conſubſtantiation*, or the *reall Preſence* in the Sacrament. We haue here then from Luther, that the impugning of the reall Preſence proceeded from the Deuill, and is hereticall: and that the Teſtimonies of Scripture for it are cleere, and not doubtfull, as alſo of the Fathers: and that for his part, he will not be a Sacramentary, world without end.

Neither was this Luthers particular opinion, for Chemnitius hath alſo written purpoſely another (10) *Booke* againſt the Sacramentaries, as alſo *Iacobus Andreas*, entituled, *Confutatio diſputationis Ioannis Iacobi Grinæi de cœna Domini*: wherin all the foreſaid authors of theſe Bookes, haue (vncharitably as Prot. complaine) condemned them for (11) *Sacramentaries*, and *Hereticks*. And heerin they haue proceeded ſo far, that they affirme with Catholickes againſt Proteſtantes, that, *the* (12) *wicked do verily receiue the Body of Chriſt*. In ſo much that the Prot. do therfore (13) reproue them.

But the Lutherans do not reſt only with the *reall Preſence*, for they defend alſo with Catholickes againſt Prot. the *Adoration* of Chriſtes Body in the Sacrament. This doth Chemnitius cleerly defend; (14) affirming moreouer this point of Adoration to be *extra Controuerſiam, out of* (15) *Controuerſy, betweene him and the Papiſtes*: Yea ſaith he, (16) *herby we ſeparate our ſelues from the Sacramentaries*. And another Lutheran Benedict Morgernſterne affirmeth, *that* (17) *Chriſt is to be adored, not only in heauen, but alſo in the Myſteries, as being preſent in the Supper*. Brentius ſaith, (18) *We confeſſe that Chriſt the ſonne of God is alwayes, and euery where to be adored, whether in heauen or in Earth, or in the Euchariſt, or out of the Euchariſt*. Georgius Princeps Anhaltinus affirmeth (19) That, 1541. *he conferred with Luther vpon this point, and ſhewed by ſundry Argumentes, that Chriſt is to be adored in the Sacrament, no leſſe then was the Holy Ghoſt deſcending in the forme of a Doue*. Timotheus Kirchmeius teacheth alſo

(8) *De forma ne Euchar.*
(9) See Bridges in his Defence of the Gouernment, and Perkins in his 4. Treatiſes how to apply Gods word.
(10) *Exam. part. 2. p. 110.*
(11) *Vide libros ſup. cit.*
(12) *Iac. Andreas in Confut. Diſp. Grinæi de cœna Dom. p. 110.*
(13) *Vide Apol. Modeſt. ad Art. Conuentus* 15. *Theol.*
(14) *Exam. part. 1. p. 92.*
(15) *Ib. p. 92. poſt med.*
(16) *Ib. p. 94. circ. med.*
(17) *Tract. de Eccl. p. 135. initio & proſ.*
(18) *In Apol. Confeſſ. Witt.*
(19) *Vide Georg. Princ. Anhalt. propoſit. Magdeb.*

also out of Luther that, (20) *The Sacrament is to be adored kneeling, because that the true Body of our Lord is there present.* And D. Luther himselfe adored also in like manner, and writ a speciall Treatise therof, entituled, *De* (21) *adoratione Sacramenti ad fratres.* Which opinion of Luthers, concerning the Adoration of the B. Sacrament, the Prot. (22) acknowledge and reprehend; of which reprehension made by Prot. Luther himselfe taketh notice and complaineth, saying: (23) *They mocke vs as their plaiefers, calling vs shamefull eaters of flesh and drinkers of blood, and that we worship a God made of Bread.* This is so clearly the Doctrine of Luther, that Calum saith of Luther for calling it *Adorabile Sacramentum*, (24) *Madnes draweth with it Idolatry. For to what end is that of Luther, adorabile Sacramentum, a Sacrament to be adored, but that an Idoll should be erected in the Temple of God?* And yet this notwithstanding, Calum esteemeth Luther, (25) *For an excellent Apostle of Christ.* Well then Luther believed and his followers, and in this faith he persisted euen after that the Protestants doctrine was explained (26) vnto him by other learned Protestantes: And yet notwithstanding all this, Prot. do owne and challenge him for theirs.

But to come to Caluinistes also, who speaketh more plainly then Beza, who writeth two homilies with this inscription, (27) *Two homilies against the Error of the Sacramentaries, for the true Presence of Christ in the Supper of the Lord*: In the later wherof, to omit sundry such like, he sayth, (28) *We dissent from them, who for the thing of the Sacrament, do place the vertue and merits of Christ, seuered from Christ himselfe: for Christ said not, This is the merit of my Body, deliuered for you, but, This is my Body, and this is my blood. Neither as it added in vaine &c. which is giuen for you, and which is shed for you: so that it could not be said more plainly, Christ himselfe, whose Body was giuen for vs, and blood shed for vs, to be truly giuen to vs in the supper, to the nourishment of eternall life: And therfore the thing of that Sacrament is that very Body, which he offered for vs vpon the Crosse, and that very blood which he shed for our sinnes; we are so far frō dreaming of any Symbolicall or typicall body, or allegoricall blood.* And the same he teacheth in (29) other places. And the like might be produced frō (30) Calum.

Barnes

(20) Ser. 4. de Sacram. Altaris. fol. 188.
(21) In thesauro &c. fol. 580.
(22) Of this Booke see in Benedict Morgenstierne Trac. de Eccl. p. 147. circa med. & 149. ant. med.
(23) *Vide Apol. Mod. ad Art. Conuent.* 19. Theol. Targa nuper habit. p. 40. circ. med.
(24) *Luther Tom 7. Wittemb. de Euch. f.* 333.
(25) *Ep. 71. ad Bucerum.*
(26) *L 1. de lib. arb. cont. Albert. Pigh.* See more of Luther in Gualt. fol. 30.
(27) Herof Cowpers Chronicle. fol. 200 circ. med. And M Sleidans Comment. l. 6. f. 84.

Barnes, a Foxian Martyr, in his proteſtation at his death, ſaid expreſly, that the Sacrament after the wordes ſpoken by the Prieſt, doth change the ſubſtance of Bread & wyne, into the very Body and bloud of Chriſt: which his Proteſtation being then publiſhed by a profeſſed Ghoſpeller of that tyme, and then alſo anſwered vnto by D. Standiſh in his Booke then printed in Engliſh, the ſaid wordes are yet extant therin, though fraudulently ſince omitted by Foxe, (31) who following the ſaid Copy verbatim, and comming by courſe to theſe very wordes, doth purpoſely ouerpaſſe them. The ſame Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation, was beleiued alſo by the (32) L. Cobham. So that we haue Huſſites, Lutherans, and Caluiniſtes teaching with vs from the Scriptures the Reall Preſence of Chriſtes Body & Bloud in the moſt Bleſſed Sacrament.

(27) *Extant Tom. 3. operum eius.*
(28) *Acts mod.*
(29) *Quæſt. & reſp. q. 29. q. 6.*
(30) *Inſtit. l. 4. c. 17. §. 5. §. 10. §. 16. §. 19. §. 33.*
(31) *Act. Mon. p. 610, 611, 612.*
(32) *Act. Mon. p. 278.*

SECT. VII.

Obiections taken from the Scriptures, in diſproofe of the Reall Preſence, anſwered.

THe Textes of ſacred Scripture being ſo confeſſedly cleere for the *Reall Preſence* as hath bene ſhewed, let vs now ſee what poore Obiections they make againſt it. Some obiect, that what our Sauiour tooke into his handes, bleſſed, and brake, that he gaue to his Diſciples: but he tooke, bleſſed and brake bread; therfore it was but Bread which he gaue to his Diſciples. Anſw. It was not the ſame which our Sauiour tooke, and which he gaue, for he tooke common bread, but by his bleſſing and power of his word, he changed the ſame into his Body, and ſo gaue it to them, and ſo betwixt *tooke* and *gaue*, paſſeth the word, *bleſſed*, which maketh, that all the verbes gouern not the ſame accuſatiue caſe in the ſame manner: as if one ſhould ſay, a certaine man ſtruck Peter, ſlew him, and buried him, he doth not meane that he buryed him aliue, though he ſtroke him aliue. Yea Prot. themſelues are inforced to anſwere this Argument, for

they teach, that our Sauiour taking common and ordinary bread, made it Sacramentall: ſo that it was not the ſame thing which he tooke and gaue.

Secondly it is obiected, that the word (*is*) is oftentimes taken in Scripture for (*ſignify,*) therfore in the Sacrament there is not Chriſtes Body, but Bread a ſigne therof. Anſw. Though this hath bene ſufficiently (1) anſwered before, yet I add, that the word (*is*) is more often taken for its owne ſignification. Secondly, it is ſo taken in Explication of wordes, as to ſay, *Amare eſt diligere*, becauſe here one ſigne is affirmed of another, and becauſe the very being and Eſſence of a ſigne is to ſignify: and ſo euen in theſe propoſitions, *is*, doth ſignify to be, and becauſe the very being and Eſſence of words, is to ſignify, therefore, *is*, is explicated by, *ſignify*; but in other propoſitions of things, not of words, as in this Propoſition, *Hoc eſt corpus meum*, where, that which is the *predicatum*, is not formally a ſigne, (*is*) cannot be expreſſed by *ſignify*. This truth is ſo certaine, as that M. Hooker ſpeaking heerof ſayth, (2) *We do not interprete the words of Chriſt, as if the name of his Body did but import the figure of his Body, and to be, were only to ſignify.* And the ſame is defended by Kechermanus, ſaying, (3) *Others will haue the figure to be in the Copula (is) which alſo cannot be proued, for &c.* So confeſſed it is that, *is*, is not taken for, *ſignify*.

(1) See before. ſect. 5.

(2) Eccleſ. Pol. l. 5. ſect. 67. p. 177.

(3) Syſtem. Theol. p. 444.

The third Obiection is, the *Lambe* is called the (4) *Paſſouer*, (5) *Circumciſion the Couenant*, being but figures thereof; ſo alſo our Sauiour is called a (6) *Vyne*, a (7) *Dore*, a (8) *Rocke*, and the like, all which are figuratiue ſpeaches: therefore in like ſort is the Sacrament figuratiuely called the body of Chriſt. Anſw. Of this Obiection I ſay with S. Auſtine, (9) *If the preiudice of any erroneous perſuaſiō preoccupate the mynd, whatſoeuer the Scripture hath to the contrary, men take it to be a figuratiue ſpeach.* Wherefore firſt I anſwere, By the ſame conſequence may be proued all other ſpeaches in Scripture to be figuratiue. 2. The *Lambe* is not called the *paſſouer* figuratiuely, becauſe it ſignifyeth the ſame, for what ſimilitude is there betwixt the killing of a Lambe, and our Lords paſſing ouer? wherefore it is ſo called properly, euen as the feſtiuall day

(4) Exod. 12. 11.

(5) Gen. 17. 10.

(6) Io. 15. 1.

(7) Io. 10. 9.

(8) 1. Cor. 10. 4.

(9) De Doct. Chriſt. l. 3. c. 10.

was

was called *Pascha*, because the Lambe was sacrifyced, and the festiuall day kept in memory and honour of the sayd Passeouer of our Lord: and so in the Ghospell, the *Paschall Lambe* is absolutly called the (10) *Pascha*. And though it were taken figuratiuely, yet is it expounded sufficiently, being called the (11) *Sacrifice of our Lords Passe-ouer, and the bloud thereof, being* (12) *a token for the vpon the houses*. 3. *Circumcision* is not only a signe, but euen the Couenant it selfe; And so Iacobus Andreas a Prot. teacheth that, (13) *It doth not only signify the Couenant, but also is in very deed the Couenant* (it selfe.) And though the Scripture should, as is obiected, call it the Couenant figuratiuely, yet as other (14) Prot. do obserue, the Scripture doth explaine it selfe sufficiently in the same place, in that it doth there also call *Circumcision*, (15) *The signe of the Couenant*. Luther himselfe decydeth this Argument, thinking it as wise a proofe, as if a man should argue, that (16) *Sara or Rebecca brought forth Children, and remayned virgins, because our Lady did so*.

(10) *Luc.* 22. 7. 8. *Mar.* 14. 12.
(11) *Exod.* 12. 27.
(12) *Exod.* 12. 13.
(13) *Confut. Disp.* 10. *Iac. Grinæi. p.* 209.
(14) *Bulling. Dec. p.* 988 & *Commonefact. de sacra cœna. &c. p.* 102.
(15) *Gen.* 17. 11.
(16) *Defens. verb. Cœnæ. fol.* 386.

As for the words *Rocke, doore, vyne*, and the like, they are sufficiently explained in Scriptures. Christ is called the (17) *Spirituall Rocke* by S. Paul. And (18) Christ himself expoundeth in what sense he is a *vyne*, and his *Disciples, branches*. And when he calleth himselfe, a *Dore*, it is expressely sayd, *that he spake it by way of a* (19) *Prouerbe*. So that it is euident, euen by the places obiected, that the foresayd sayings are not taken litterally, neyther were they euer so vnderstood by any one Interpreter: whereas the foresayd words, *This is my Body*, are not expounded or qualifyed, by any of the Euangelistes, or S. Paul, otherwise then the litterall sense of it selfe affoardeth. And the same Interpretation of the foresayd obiected places, is giuen by sundry (20) Prot. writers. But because this Obiection is so frequently vrged, I further adde, that whereas in the example of the B. Sacrament, our Sauiour did take a certayne portion of Bread into his hand, & pointing to that determinate Substance, sayd, *This is my body*; in the other examples he pointed not, or spake to any determinate substance, so much as then present, or in being, into which he might be changed; but vseth only a generall name

(17) 1. *Cor.* 10. 4.
(18) *Io.* 15. 4: 5. 6.
(19) Io. 10. 6.
(20) *Bulling. in his Dec. in Engl. Dec.* 5. *ser. p.* 988. *See Vrsius his Commonefactio &c. p.* 102. *Iosias Nichols in his Abrahams Faith, p.* 111. *Pratorius de Sacramentis. p.* 128.

name of a kind of Substance, as *I am a vyne &c*, which hath in it selfe no determinate and proper being, and therefore must needs be figuratiue. Agayne, in these obiected examples, one different nature is affirmed of another, which would be cleerely false, if thereby should be signifyed identity of nature or Substanc, and not only lykenes of Condition or Property: whereas in these wordes, *This is my Body*, one different nature is not affirmed of another, for I haue proued before, that the Pronowne, *This*, pointeth not at all to *Bread*, but to *Body*. Lastly, these and other such lyke (21) examples vulgarly obiected, are all of them spoken vpon occasion of Explication, and to explaine some other truth or saying, then formerly in being, or precedent; whereas these other wordes, *This is my Body*, are not spoken vpon occasion, or for explication of any other saying, or truth then precedent, but are originally vttered, as by way of Institution, to ordaine no lesse then a Sacrament, then before not in being. It is therefore more then licentious bouldnes, to affirme these wordes to be figuratiue, because the other are. And by like liberty, a man may defend any old or new heresy, though neuer so damnable.

(21) Gen. 41. 26. Apoc. 17. 9. Mat. 13.

Fourthly it is obiected that these words, (22) *This Cup is the new Testament in my Blood*, must be taken figuratiuely, for first the Cup is taken for the thing contayned, and whether the same be wine or bloud, yet it is not the Testament, but the signe thereof. I answer. 1. to take the Cup for the thing contayned, is a figure most ordinary, and the same withall is cleerely expressed by our Sauiours saying, *take, drinke, This is the Cup*, for not the vessell, but the liquour is drunke, neyther was the vessell, but the liquour shed for vs. Besides insteed of those wordes, *This is the Cup*, set downe by S. Luke and S. Paul, S. Matthew and S. Marke say, *This is the Bloud*: now, wordes obscure and figuratiue, are to be expounded by other more cleer and proper. And certainly if a man should say of the same vessell, drinke of this Cup, & should annex, drinke of this wyne, none would doubt, but that wyne, were contayned in that Cup, and that man intended to make known the same: wherfore seeing the holy Ghost

(22) Luc. 22. 20. 1. Cor. 11. 25.

Ghoſt By two of his wryters, ſaith, *This is the Cup*, & by other two of the ſame thing, *This is the Bloud*, it may not be doubted, but that bloud is contained in the Cup. 3. The word *Teſtament*, is not taken improperly, for the body and bloud of Chriſt vnder the formes of Bread and wyne, but is truly his Teſtament, wherby is giuen to the worthy receiuer, title and intereſt to an euerlaſting Inheritance: & though it were figuratiue, yet it is ſufficiently expreſſed by S. Matthew, plainly ſaying, *This is the bloud of the new Teſtament*,

A fifth Obiection is, Chriſt ſayd, (23) *Do this for a Commemoration of me*; but memory or Commemoration is of thinges abſent, therefore Chriſt is not really preſent in the Sacrament. I anſwere, what this meaneth Saint Paul teacheth ſaying: (24) *As often as you ſhall eate this Bread, and drinke the Chalice, you ſhall ſhew the death of our Lord vntill he come.* Now, Chriſtes death and Paſſion is not preſent, but abſent, yea it is not, but was. Secondly it is not ſaid here, to be only a Commemoration or remembrance, but only we are here commanded to do it in remembrance, which we daily do. Thirdly, one and the ſame thing in ſundry reſpectes may be a body, and yet a figure, ſigne, or remembrance therof: ſo was Chriſtes Body transfigured vpon the Mount (25) Thabor, a figure of his Body glorifyed in heauen; and ſo alſo is he called, (26) *The figure of his Fathers ſubſtance*, and is yet alſo of, and the ſame ſubſtance. This Obiection though moſt common, is yet ſo poore, as that it is anſwered by Caluin ſaying, (27) *The ſupper is a remembrance &c. But where ſome gather from hence, that therfore Chriſt is abſent from the ſupper, the Anſwere is ready &c.*

(23) *Luc.* 22. 19.

(24) 1. *Cor.* 11. 26.

(25) *Mat.* 17. 2.

(26) *Heb.* 1. 3. See the like *Phil.* 2. 6. 2. *Cor.* 4. 4.

(27) *In omnes Pauli Epiſt. in.* 1. *Cor.* 11. *p.* 333.

Sixtly it is obiected, that after the Inſtitution of the Sacrament, Chriſt ſaid, (28) *I will not drinke from henceforth of this fruite of the vyne*: therfore it was wyne which before he had immediatly drunke. I anſwere firſt, S. Luke who vndertooke to (29) *write thinges in order*, ſetteth downe the forſaid wordes before the Inſtitution of the Sacrament, (30) applying them to the tyme of the eating of the Paſchall Lambe, of which in the ſame place he vſeth the ſame wordes, ſaying, *From* (31) *this tyme I will not eate it, till it be fulfilled in*

(28) *Mat.* 26. 29.

(29) *Luc.* 1. 3.

(30) *Luc.* 22. 28.

(31) *Luc.* 22. 16.

in the kindome of God: which being true, it euidently followeth, that seeing our Sauiour said at the tyme of the eating of the Paschall Lambe, which was before the Institution of the Sacrament, that he would not drinke from that tyme of the fruit of the vyne, that therfore that which he dranke afterwards, was not wyne, but his precious bloud. And that this Interpretation is most true, is confessed by Hutterus, saying, (32) *Those wordes, I will not drinke of this fruite of the Vyne &c. our Sauiour spake in treating of the Sacrament of the old Testament*, to wit, *the Paschall Lambe*. 2. Though it were vnderstood of the Sacrament, yet it might be called Wyne, as the Body also is called (33) Bread, for 3. causes. First because it was so before; so Aarons rod being turned into a serpent, (34) was yet afterwards called a rod: So water turned into wyne, (35) was yet after called water. 2. Because it keepeth the formes of bread and wyne, and thinges are called as they appeare, so Angels appearing in the shape of men, were called (36) men. 3. Because Christ in this Sacrament, is very true and principall bread & wyne, feeding and refreshing vs in Body and Soule, vntill we arriue to euerlasting happines. And lastly Prot. themselues do teach that (37) *vnder the name of Bread the Scripture doth* (sometymes) *vnderstand not naked bread, but all kind of food, which concernith this present lyfe, or the eternall*: according to which acceptance, the Sacrament may be called Bread, and so is Christ himselfe called (38) Bread.

(32) *De sacrificio Miss. p.393.*
(33) *1. Cor.10. 16.*
(34) *Exod. 7.10.12.*
(35) *Io.2. 9.*
(36) *Gen.18.2. 19.5. Mar.16. 5. Luc.24.4. Act.1.10.*
(37) *Aretius loc.com. p. 260. & 40. Marloret. in Enchyr.* at the word *Panis.*
(38) *Io. 6.35. 48.52.*

Many obiect that the very word *Transubstantiation*, was but lately inuented. Answ. The word *Transubstantiation* was read and knowne some hundreds of yeares before the name Protestãt was heard or dreamed of; for that was expressed in the Coũcel of Laterane, which was celebrated Anno 1215. this was but stamped since the tyme of Luther, some hundred yeares agoe. And that difficult places of Scripture may be cleered and expressed by words not set downe in Scripture, Caluin (39) acknowledgeth and proueth by examples of the words *Trinity*, & *Persons*.

(39) *Inst.l.1. c.13.§.3.*

SECT.

SECT. VIII.

Obiections, against the poſsibility of the Reall Preſence, anſwered.

SOme Prot. thinke the Doctrine of the reall Preſence to imply in it certaine and ſeuerall Contradictions, and therfore to be impoſſible; As firſt, that the being of Chriſtes Body in many places at once (which muſt needs be admitted if the reall Preſence be granted) doth contradict the Vnity of his Body, which is but one, and not multiplied. 2. The being of Chriſtes whole Body in ſo ſmall an hoſt, doth alſo contradict the greater quantity of his Body. 3. His being there inuiſible, and without Circumſcription, doth likewiſe (ſay they) contradict the truth and naturall properties of his humane Body. In reguard herof Beza ſaith, *Nego* (1) *Deum poſſe &c. I deny that God is able to make Chriſtes Body preſent in the Euchariſt.* Ridley alſo ſaith, (2) *I do affirme, that it is impoſſible for Chriſt to be both in heauen, and earth at one time.* In like manner (3) D. Whitaker diſcourſeth at large, endeauouring to proue the Reall Preſence, to be a Contradiction, and therfore impoſſible.

(1) Cont. Brent.
(2) In the Actes and Monum. p. 964.
(3) In his Anſw. to Reinolds p. 179. & 180.

For our better proceeding and eaſier diſſoluing of all theſe falſly pretended difficulties & contradictions, faigned and deuiſed only by the Aduerſaries of the Reall Preſence, we affirme firſt, that according to *Rules of Logicke* (according to which only, a Contradiction muſt be examined) a Contradiction doth conſiſt of two Propoſitions, or ſayings, wherof the one is an affirmatiue, the other a negatiue, or deniall of that which is affirmed; as for example to ſay, that Chriſts Body is preſent in this place, and Chriſts Body is not preſent in this place, theſe two ſayings are contradictory, and being taken (*ſecundum idem*) that is, in one and the ſame reſpect, they cannot by any poſſibility be both of them true. Or ſecondly a Contradiction is that which cannot ſtand with the eſſence of the things, as to ſay, that one

and the ſame tyme, and other like Circumſtances, is, and is not. But the Preſence of Chriſtes Body in this place, and that place, yea in a million of places at one tyme, is not of this kind, for it denieth not the being of his Body in either place, but only affirmeth the Preſence therof in all places where it is. Neither is it againſt the eſſence of Chriſtes Body, or deſtroyeth the nature of Chriſtes Body, to be in the Sacrament, and in as many places, as that ſacred and immaculate hoſt is offered vp. For better illuſtration wherof, I will giue ſome like reſemblances: firſt in the myſtery of the B. Trinity, do we not belieue, that one and the ſelfeſame ſubſtance, and diuine Eſſence in number to be at once and for euer in three ſeuerall and diſtinct perſons? A matter no leſſe wonderfull, then the manifold Preſence of Chriſtes Body in many places: for as there is in the Sacrament a Diſtinction of places, ſo in this Miſtery of the Trinity a diſtinction of perſons; and therfore, as there is in this a moſt ſimple vnity, of nature or eſſence, notwithſtanding the diſtinction of perſons, ſo in the other alſo without all danger of Contradiction, there may be a like vnity of Body, notwithſtanding the aforeſaid diſtinction of places. And here the Arrians might, and did aſwell cauill about this Miſtery of the Trinity, as the Proteſtantes do now about the Reall Preſence.

A ſecond reſemblance of this Miſtery, may be giuen in the ſoule of Man: this ſoule not being proportionable to the extenſion of the Body, (for ſo it were materiall depending of the Body, and mortall with it) but an indiuiſible vnity and immortall, is notwithſtanding, as both Philoſophy and Truth teacheth, wholy in the whole Body, and wholy in euery part therof; and we may eaſily imagine, that God by his power is able to conſerue it at once in ſeuerall members cut of, and deuided from the ſaid Body, euen as it was before in the ſame members, when they were vnited to the Body.

This difficulty may alſo be better conceiued, though not proued, by example of one and the ſame word, the which being once vttered, is therupon at one and the ſame inſtant

inſtant in the hearing of ſundry perſons, and not as a confuſed and indiſtinct noyſe multiplied in the ayre, but as one peculiar word diſtinguiſhed with the ſame ſyllables, wherin it was vttered. As alſo one Seale doth impart to ſundry peeces of waxe, one and the ſame Print or forme; and ſundry looking glaſſes can in like manner containe in them at one tyme, euen one and the ſame fauour or reſemblance.

Add herunto, that albeit Prot. do ſay and thinke, that Luther erred in point of the Sacrament, yet certes they cannot doubt, but that he was ſo learned as to diſcerne a Contradiction: thus then he ſayth therof, (4) *What Scriptures haue they to proue, that theſe two Propoſitions be directly contrary, Chriſt ſitteth in heauen, and Chriſt is in the ſupper. The contradiction is in their carnall Imagination, not in faith, or the word of God.* The like is affirmed by Ioachim Weſtphalus, ſaying, (5) *The body of man is circumſcribed in one place, therfore at one tyme it cannot be but in one place, therfore not in all places where the ſupper is miniſtred. Is not this Geometricall Argument fetched from Euclids demonſtrations, the Pillar and vp holder of all theſe Sacramentaries &c? Philoſophy brought forth all hereſies, and she begat the Errour of Zwinglius.* And with him agreeth (6) Brentius, whom M. Iewell termeth, (7) *A moſt graue and learned Father:* and ſo do the 15. Proteſtant Deuines aſſembled togeather in Saxony, their wordes are as followeth, (8) *Whereas the Sacramentaries do ſay, that the Body of Chriſt is in heauen, therefore it is not in the Supper, &c. Therefore Luther prouoketh all Sacramentaries, that they tell him, and ſhew him the Antitheſis, and repugnance betwixt them.* But Saint Chryſoſtome anſwereth this Obiection, ſaying, (9) *This is one Sacrifice, otherwiſe by this reaſon, becauſe it is offered in many places, there ſhould be many Chriſtes; not ſo, but one Chriſt in euery place, beere whole, and there whole, one Body.* Laſtly M. Foxe, (who ſhould be able, as a man would thinke, to diſcerne a Contradiction, who was able to write ſuch a huge volume of lyes, as is his Actes and Monuments) ſaith, (10) *That Chriſt abyding in heauen, is no let, but that he may be in the Sacrament, if he liſt.*

Add heerunto, that a body to be in a place, is not of the Eſſence of a Body, but meerely extrinſecall, and acciden-

(4) Luth. tom Wittemb 1. fol. 57. defenſ verb. cœnæ f. 488. See further Luthers opinion herin alleadged by Pet. Martyr in his Diſp. annexed to his com. plac. in Eng. P. 221.

(5) *In Apol. cont. Calu. c. 19. p. 194.*

(6) *Ho. 50. 2. Tom. in Euang. Lucæ.*

(7) In his Defence of the Apol. p. 473.

(8) *In Apol. Modeſt. ad acta conuent. 15. Theol. Torgæ ſuper habit. p. 26. ante med.*

(9) *In Ep ad Hebræos. ho. 17. S. Ambr. in Heb c. 10. Nyſſ in orat. Catech. c 37.* and see S. *Chryſ ſtome de Sacerd. l. 3.*

cidentary, for the higheſt heauen is a true Body, and is not yet in any place: wherefore to be in any place, or more places, is not to contradict the Eſſence of a true Body, and by Conſequence poſſible.

c 4. & ho. 2. ad Pop. fin. (10) In his Act. & Mon. p. 998. And ſee many more Prot. confeſſing the poſſibility in the Liturgy. Tract. 2. ſec. 4 p. 150. 1. 1.

Chriſt our Saviour when he appeared to S. (11) Paul, was at the ſame tyme in the higheſt heauen, and vpon the Earth, or in the ayre neere the Earth: therfore, as then Chriſtes body was in heauen, and neere vnto the Earth. That Chriſt as then was in heauen Prot. grant, and it appeareth by thoſe words ſpoken of him, (12) *Whom heauen truly muſt receiue, vntill the tymes of the reſtitution of all things*: that he was alſo neere the Earth in the ayre, is euident by the text, and wilbe made more euident by the enſuing diſcourſe.

(11) Act. 9. 4. 5. 17. & 22. 8. 9. 15. 16. (12) Act. 3. 21.

Heerto two anſwers are framed by Iohn Caluin. 1. (13) that S. Paul ſaw not Chriſt in his owne perſon, but only in ſome ſhape or figure, neyther heard a voice from Chriſts owne mouth, but only ſome voyce from heauen, ſuch as was that of God the father, at his Baptiſme and Transfiguration. 2. (14) that he truly ſaw and heard Chriſt himſelfe, but as remayning in heauen, ſo that the eyes and eares of Paul did pierce the higheſt heauen. And heere it ſeemeth to me, that Caluin did not remember himſelfe, forgetting in one place what he had ſayd in another: for in his Commentaries vpon the 9. of the Actes, he auoucheth, that Paul neyther ſaw Chriſt in his owne perſon, nor yet heard any voyce from Chriſtes owne mouth; and in the fourth Booke of his Inſtitutions the 7. Chapter, he affirmeth that S. Paul truly ſaw and heard Chriſt himſelfe: is not this a Contradiction? but pardon him, for he had forgotten the ſaying, *oportuit mendacem eſſe memorem.*

(13) Inſt. 4. c. 17. §. 29. (14) Calu. inſtit. l. 4. c. 7.

But letting this Contradiction paſſe, againſt Caluins firſt gloſſe, that S. Paul truly ſaw Chriſt himſelfe, appeareth by theſe places, (15) *But the men that went in Company with him, ſtood amazed, hearing the voyce, but ſeeing no man*: Where a difference is made betwene S. Paul and his Companions, in that they ſaw no man, but only heard a voyce. Againe, (16) *Barnabas tould the Apoſtles, how in the way Paul had ſeene our Lord, and that he ſpake vnto him.* And yet in a third place, (17) *Ananias*

(15) Act. 9. 7. (16) Ib. ver. 27. (17) Ib. verſ. 27.

nias sayd, Iesus hath sent me, he that appeared to thee in the way that thou camest. And yet further, (18) *God hath preordinated thee, that thou shouldest &c. see the iust one, and heare a voyce from his mouth: because thou shalt be witnes to all men, of those things which thou hast seene and heard.* See the like (19) elsewhere. And in proofe of Christs Resurrection, numbring the other Apostles, of whome Christ was truly seene after his death, Saint Paul sayth, (20) *Last of all, as it were of an abortiue, he was seene also of me,* which proofe had beene of no force, vnles he had truly seene the very body of Christ, as the rest of the Apostles had before.

(18) *Act.* 22. 15. 16.
(19) *Act.* 26. 15. 16. 1. *Cor.* 9. 1.
(20) 1. *Cor.* 15. 8.

Concerning the second, that he saw Christ not as in heauen, but in earth, or in the aire neere the Earth, may be proued first, in that the light of him that appeared was so great, that it struck Paul (21) *blynd,* which it could not haue done, vnles it had beene neere. Besydes his Companions also saw a light, and heard a voyce, which argueth, that Christ was neere them, for it is not probable, that their eies and eares could pierce the higheſt heauens; they also *did not heare the voyce of him* (22) *that spake with Paul,* which argueth that Christ was neerer to Paul, whereas if he had spoken from heauen, all might haue heard alyke. Further if S. Paul had seene him in the higheſt heauen, he would not haue doubted who he had been, saying, *who art thou O Lord,* nor yet haue needed that answere of our Lord, *I am Iesus whome thou persecutest.* Lastly, Prot. much meruaile, how the Saints in heauen can haue so long eyes and eares, as to see & know thinges done vpon Earth. Much more may we meruayle, how the Carnall eyes, and eares of Paul could reach from Earth to heauen: and if this perforce they must attribute to the power of God (which though it did not happen, yet to be possible we grant) with farre lesse reason can they deny through the same power, the like priuiledge to the glorifyed soules.

(21) *Act.* 9. 8.
(22) *Act.* 22. 10.

S. Paul being in prison, it is sayd, (23) *The night following our Lord standing by him, sayd, be constant: for as thou hast testifyed of me in Hierusalem, so must thou testify at Rome also.* This place is so conuincing, that the Prot. (24) of Geneua, instead

(23) *Act.* 23. 11.
(24) *Anno* 1560. 1562. 1568. 1603.

ſteed of *ſtanding by him*, *aſſiſtens*, or *adſtans*, in Latin, do tranſlate, *ſo preſente*, *he being preſent*: and Tremelius changeth it to, *viſus eſt*, *was ſeene*. But as by ſaying, *being preſent*, this doth not impugne, but rather proue Chriſts being in the priſon with S. Paul; ſo to change *ſtanding* into *ſeeing*, is a Corruption ouer groſſe, *ſtanding*, and *ſeeing* being things ſo different: And therefore (25) Fulke and other Tranſlatours do truly ſay, *ſtood by him*. Now this proueth that though he was in heauen, yet was he alſo at the ſame tyme in the priſon with Paul; neither will it ſuffice to ſay, that it was an Angel that ſtood by him, for the Text ſaith, it was our Lord. Neither was it an Angell, but Chriſt our Lord, of whome he had *teſtifyed in Hieruſalem*, and whome *he was to teſtify in Rome*.

(25) Againſt Rhem. Teſt. in Act. 23. 11. Bib. of 1578.

Examples of other like apparitions of Chriſt vpon earth, are plentifull in the ancient Fathers: as to S. Peter whereof S. (26) Ambroſe: Alſo vnto S. Anthony, as appeareth in S. (27) Athanaſius: To S. Tharſilla, whereof ſee S. (28) Gregory: To S. Gregory himſelfe, witneſſe whereof is Ioannes (29) Diaconus.

(26) *In orat. cont. Auxentium. Egeſip. l. 3. de Excidio Hieruſ. c. 2.*
(27) *Athanaſ. in Apol. pro fuga ſua.*
(28) *L. 4. Dial. c. 16.*
(29) *L. 2. Vitæ ipſius. c. 22. Paulinus Ep ad Macharium.*

But againſt this ſome further vrge, that Chriſtes Body as it is vpon the Aultar is not continuated with it ſelfe, as it is in heauen, for many other Bodies are betwixt; therefore it is deuided, and ſo not one. To this, I anſwere, in that Caſe it is neither continuated, nor diſcontinuated or deuided, for this doth properly belõg to things which be many, whether they the wholes or parts. And therefore though many Bodies be betwixt Chriſts Body, as it is in heauen and vpon the Aultar, yet this proueth not that Chriſtes Body is deuided in reſpect of it ſelfe, but only in reſpect of the place, to wit, that heauen and Earth are diſcontinuated.

It is vrged againe, if a Body can be in two places at one tyme, then at the ſame tyme it may be remote & neere, come to, and go from the ſaid place; in one place be extreme hoat, and in another place extreme cold, in one place be wounded and ſlayne, and in another be ſafe and aliue, or the like, all which imply. Anſw. Such reſpects are multiplied as follow the places, not others: ſo in the forſayd caſe it might be aboue and below, neere and remote

remote, moue and reſt &c. none of which do repugne, ſeeing they are in diuers reſpects, to wit, in reguard of diuers places: euen as the ſoule of man, which as it is in the head and feete, is remote, and not remote from the Earth; & one hand mouing, the other reſting, the ſoule at the ſame tyme is ſayd to moue and reſt. Now ſuch actions and qualities as do not agree to the Body in reguard of the place, but in reguard of it ſelfe, and ſo are receiued and inherent in the body it ſelfe, are not multiplied, no more then the Body it ſelfe: So a Body hoat in one place, is alſo hoat in another; and if extreme heate ſhould be applyed in one place, and extreme cold in another, it ſhould be in the ſame ſtate, as if the ſayd Contraries were applyed to a body in one place, that is, neither extreme hoat, nor extreme cold: and ſo if a man ſhould be hungry, wounded, ſlaine &c. in one place, the like he ſhould be in another. Add laſtly what Melanchon ſaith heereof in generall, (30) *I had rather dye, then affirme this which the Zwingliani affirme, that Chriſts Body cannot be but in one place. Therefore conſtantly reproue them pubblickly and priuatly when occaſion ſhalbe.* And this may ſuffice for anſwere to the firſt ſuppoſed Contradiction of Chriſtes Body being in diuers places.

(30) *Ep. ad Martinum Goroliticum.*

The ſecond ſuppoſed Contradiction is, that it doth imply, for Chriſtes Body to be contained within ſo ſmall a compaſſe, as is the Sacramentall hoſt. But to this I anſwer, as it is not eſſentiall to a Body to occupy a place, ſo neither is it eſſentiall, that the greatnes of the place muſt portionably anſwere the greatnes of the Body: for neyther place, nor anſwerable greatnes of place to the body, is put in the definition of a Body, which they ſhould be, if they were eſſentiall to a Body; and the higheſt heauen hath exceeding great magnitude, and yet is without all place.

Againe, it is no more impoſſible for Chriſtes Body to be in the Sacrament, then it is for a Camel to goe through the eye of a needle: & yet our Sauiour ſayth, (31) *It is eaſier for a Camel to goe through the eye of a needle, then a rich man to enter into the kingdome of God.* And whereas the Apoſtles heerupon demanding, *who then can be ſaued?* Chriſt anſwered, *with men*

(31) *Mat.19. 24. Mar.10. 25.27.*

this

this is impoſſible, but with God all things are poſſible: heere, that which is more hard, to wit, a Rich man to be ſaued, is ſayd to be poſſible; therefore much more poſſible is that which is ſayd to be more eaſy, to wit, for a Camel to go through the eye of a needle; but this is not poſſible to be but by the Camel not occupying place: therefore a Body may be, and not occupy place; & by what meanes ſoeuer it be, it is more incredible & improportionable according to humane ſenſe, then for the Body of a man to be in the Sacrament: but with God theſe & all other thinges are poſſible.

This poſſibility is affirmed by the Ancient (32) Fathers, yea and by ſome of the Prot. writers: for M. Willet in his Synopſis confeſſeth that, (33) *God by his abſolute power, can draw the huge Body of a Camell, remayning ſtill of that bignes, through a needles eye:* only he denyeth that it can be, that God will do it, *becauſe* (ſayth he) *it is contrary to the law of nature.*

And heere I would demaund, whether it were not as ſtrange, that the Godhead of Chriſt being infinite, ſhould yet be wholly in the limited nature of humanity, and before his natiuity wholy alſo in his Mothers wombe, ſhe being therefore called the *Mother of our* (34) *Lord, and the Mother of* (35) *God?*

This may be ſomewhat explayned by the example of the ſight of the eye, which being but a ſmall member, comprehendeth in it (in full proportion of outward ſhew, incomparably aboue the bignes of it ſelfe) the externall figure and largenes of a great part both of heauen and earth, with a diſtinguiſhed and anſwerable proportion of hills, dales, fields, and buildings, which at once, it receyueth and diſcerneth. And, which is more, we ſee by experience that, a Looking glaſſe, or a litle Diamond, do comprehend in them the externall ſhew of breadth and length of great Chambers & places exceeding greater then themſelues, & that (which is moſt) in ſuch due and anſwerable proportion, that whoſoeuer behouldeth but in the ſayd glaſſe or Diamond the ſaid figures ſo in them repreſented, ſhall withall behould in them a ſhew of proportion and largeneſſe far exceeding the ſayd glaſſe or Diamond, and ſo great as if he had ſeene the things themſelues:

(32) *Aug. de Spir. & lit. c.1. Nazianzen l.4. de Theol. Orig. in c.19. Matthæi.*
(33) Printed 1600. p. 516.
(34) *Luc.1. 43.*
(35) *Vide Vincent. Lyrin. l. aduerſ. her. paul. ant. med. Amb. l.2. de Virg. Ephrem de laud. Mariæ. Et Conc. Epheſ. in Ep. ad Neſtor. Et Conc. Conſtantinop. 5. ſub Iuſtin. Imperat. c. 6. Epiph. in Anchor. iuxta med.* And ſee the Centuriſtes confeſſing and reporting this. cent. 5. col. 801. 608. 114. See alſo Socrates hiſt. l. 7. c.42.

themſelues. And it is in reaſon no more ſtrange, for a man to be in no greater a roome then the Sacrament, then it is for the ſoule of man (which is an indiuiſible vnity, & of it ſelfe can fully rende in leſſe then a needles point) to be as it were dilated, and extended as far as the whole Body of Man. But this Doctrine is ſo true, that Luther affirmeth, (36) *that a body of quantity, may be without a quantitiue meaſure.* And M. Iewell likewiſe acknowledgeth, (37) *That God is able by his omnipotent power, to make Chriſtes Body preſent, without place and quantity:* ſo tar in his opinion was this matter from all contradiction.

(36) Luther cited by Pet. Martyr. in Diſp. annex loc. com. Anglic.
(37) Reply againſt Harding. p. 152.

This alſo is ſtrongly confirmed by this relation made by S. Iohn, that, (38) *When the doores were ſhut where the Diſciples were gathered together for feare of the Iewes, Ieſus came and ſtood in the middeſt.* Whereupon the Diſciples (39) *were troubled, and affrighted, and imagined that they ſaw a ſpirit.* Now this could not be, but either by his Body not occupying a place, or elſe by penetration of Bodies, which is as difficult. And the like might be ſhewed in Chriſtes Natiuity, Reſurrection, and Aſcenſion. Beſides it is as naturall for fire to burne, for a thing coloured to be ſeene, for a thing heauy to waigh downe, for the water to be fluxible, and not to haue the quality of ſuſtayning a heauy body, as it is for a Body to occupy a place: and yet with all theſe thinges hath Gods Omnipotency miraculouſly diſpenſed, yea ſuſpended and hindered the naturall courſe therof, though the organs, obiects, meanes, and all other things were applied, as appeateth by the *Buſh* which (40) Moyſes ſaw burne and conſumed not: by the *fyery fornace*, whereinto the 3. Children were (41) caſt: by the *axe* which falling into the water, (42) by vertue of the Prophets word, did ſwimme aboue the water: by Chriſtes *walking* (43) *vpon the waters*, at the ſight wherof, the thing being ſupernaturall, the Diſciples were ſo affraid that they cryed out, *it was a ſpirit:* By *Chriſtes* (44) *paſſing* through the middeſt of them, that had brought him to the *edge of a hill &c. that they might throw him downe headlong:* By the Iſraelites paſſing through the *red ſea*, (45) *for the water was as it were a wall vpon their right hand and left.* All which

(38) Io. 20. 19, 26.
(39) Luc. 24. 37.
(40) Exod. 3. 2.
(41) Dan. 3. 22, 23, 27.
(42) 4. Reg. 6. 5, 6.
(43) Mat. 14. 26.
(44) Luc. 4. 29, 30.
(45) Exod. 14. 22. Ioſ. 3. 14.

passages recorded in sacred Scripture, are as miraculous, as Christes Body being in the B. Sacrament, and yet that only must by Protestantes be denied, and all these granted.

Lastly, the third supposed Contradiction is of Christes Body, being in the Sacrament without Circumscription. Answ. But how was Christes Body circumscribed, when he entred in to his Disciples, as before, *ianuis clausis*, *the doores being shut*? for we read no where that they were miraculously opened, as the Angell opened the gates of the Prison, (46) where S. Peter was: but heer at our Sauiours entrance, the miracle consisted not in the opening of the doores, but the miracle rested in our Sauiour his suddaine *standing in the middest of the Apostles when the doores were shut*: for which cause S. Iohn very carefully obserueth, and twyce ouer reciteth, *the doores being shut*: in so much that the Apostles at this his appearance, *were* (47) *afraid*, supposing they had seene *a spirit*, as in like manner they cryed out, and were troubled, when they saw (48) him walking vpon the Sea.

This truth is acknowledged by S. Ambrose, who writing herof sayth, (49) *It was a wonder how the corporall nature passed through the impenetrable body*. S. Hilary likewise testifieth, that, (50) *Nothing of that which is solid giueth place, neither do the wood or stones by their nature loose any thing &c. Our Lordes Body doth not depart from it selfe, that it should resume it selfe of nothing, & sense and speach giueth place, and the truth of the fact is without mans reason*. I might alleadge (51) sundry other Testimonies of the Fathers, all confessing it to be miraculous.

But I will content my selfe with the Doctrine of the great Deuines of Geneua, who graunt, (52) *That suddainly to vanish out of sight &c. neither also to penetrate through a solid body, do take away the truth of corporall substance*. As also of M. Cranmer, who speaking hereof, teacheth that by possibility (53) *Christes body may be in the Bread and wyne, also in the doores which were shut, and stone of his Sepulcher*. Wherupon the Conclusion must needs be, that our Sauiour his Body passing through the doores, either was not as then circumscribed in place; or else, which were as strange, it and the doore being two seuerall bodies, were circumscribed both in one place.

The

(46) *Act.* 5. 19. & 12. 5. 10.
(47) *Luc.* 24. 37.
(48) *Mat.* 14. 26.
(49) *Ambr. in Vit. cap. Luc.*
(50) *Hilar. lib. de Trinit. post med.*
(51) *Chrysost. de Resur. ho. 9. & in Ioan. ho. 86. Aug. in tract. sup. dicta verba Euang. & de agone Christi c. 24. Et Ep. 1. ad Volus. Epiph. hær. 64. & 20. Hier. cont. Iouin. Luc. 21 & ad Eustoch. & in Ep. ad Pammach. de erroribus Ioan. Hierosol. Cyril. in Ioan. l. 12. c. 53. Theodoret. Dialog. 2. Leo Ep. 12. ad Flau. & Ep. 83. ad Palæstinos.*
(52) *Vide Apol. Wodell. ad alia*

The ſumme of all briefly is this, If God haue often heretofore miraculouſly ſuſpended from ſundry ſortes of Bodies, ſundry of their naturall qualities, the truth and natures of the ſaid Bodies ſtill preſerued notwithſtanding, as hath bene already ſhewed: And as touching our Sauiours ſacred Body, (54) If he walked vpon the Sea, againſt the naturall propeety either of his bodies waight, or the waters fluxibility apt for diuiſion: If, as before, he paſſed through the ſacred wombe of his Virgin Mother, ſealed vp without reſeruation, penetrated the ſtone in his Reſurrection, the doores at his apparition to his Diſciples; if his Body was transformed (55) vpon the mountaine, appeared to his Diſciples in (56) another ſhape: If he ſuddainly vaniſhed, (57) as he ſate at table with two of his Diſciples, ἄφαντος ἐγένετο ἀπ' αὐτῶν, *became inſeene of them*: as alſo in like manner, (58) whence all the Synagogue &c. caſt him out of the Citty, and brought him *to the edge of the hill &c. that they might throw him downe headlong*, he by like miracle paſſing through the middeſt of them, went his way, and ſo eſcaped (59) miraculouſly: I ſay, if nature and naturall actions haue bene ſuſpended in all theſe, & euery one of them, be as miraculous, as is the being of Chriſtes B. Body in the conſecrated hoſt vpon the Aultar; and ſeeme withall to imply in each of them as much contradiction in nature, as doth the B. Sacrament, and yet there is no Contradiction in any of them againſt nature, but only the Prerogatiue and ſupreme power of the God of Nature, working aboue nature: why then ſhould the Reall Preſence of Chriſtes ſacred Body in the B. Sacrament, imply in it a Contradiction, and conſequently an Impoſſibility? I conclude all with a notable ſentence of Iuſtinus Martyr, *Quæ ſunt eorundem virium eandem habent fidem, ſiue concedantur, ſiue tollantur. Thinges of equall power haue the ſame credit, concerning beleefe, whether they be granted, or denyed.* Now let the Prot. apply, and either graunt the reall Preſence, which is no more miraculous, then the former inſtances, or els deny all, ſince they are all alike, built vpon Gods power, working aboue nature: but the former they dare not deny, therfore neither let them dare to deny this.

Comment. 15. Theol. Torgæ nuper habit. p. 35.

(53) Anſwere to Gardiner and Smith. p. 454.

(54) *Mat.* 14. 26.

(55) *Mar.* 6. 49. *Mat.* 17. 2. *Luc.* 9. 29. *Mar.* 9. 3.

(56) *Mar.* 16. 12.

(57) *Luc.* 24. 31.

(58) Luc 4. 29. 30. Of his like eſcape read Iohn. 10. 39. & 8. 59.

(59) Seehte Marg. notes of the Engl. Bible printed 1576. in Luc. 4. 30.

These premiſes conſidered, ſundry Prot. vpon a ſecond and better Conſideration do acknowledge the poſſibility of the Real preſence. Caluin ſayth, (61) *Heere that they may cauſe vs enuy, they cauſe vs to ſpeake maliciouſly of the power of God Omnipotent: but they either erre foolishly, or maliciouſly: for it is not heere queſtioned what God can do, but what he will do.* The deuines of Wittemberge ſay. (62) *We believe that the omnipotency of God is ſo great, (62) that in the Euchariſt he may either annihilate the ſubſtance of Bread, or els change them into his Body: But that God doth exerciſe this his abſolute Omnipotency in the Euchariſt we haue no certayne word of God for it.* Cranmer affirmeth that, (63) *The Controuerſy in this matter is not, what may be, but what is: Chriſts Body may be as well in the Bread, as in the Doore* (which was ſhut) *and ſtone of his Sepulcher.* Whitaker his contrary aſſertion notwithſtanding, ſayth, (64) *That Chriſt can make the Bread his Body, we grant; only ſhew that Chriſt will make of Reall Bread, his Reall fleſh, and then this Controuerſy is brought to an end.* And the ſame words are vſed by (65) Bruis. So conteſtedly is the Real Preſence poſſible.

(60) Inſtit. prim. Argent. de cœna Dom. c 11. p. 336.

(62) Harm. of Conf. p. 454.

(63) Anſw. to Steuen Gard, p. 454.

(64) Anſwere to Reyn p. 192.

(65) In his Serm. vpon the Sacram. ſer. 3. fol. 85.

SECT. IX.

Obiections againſt the Real Preſence of Chriſtes Body and Bloud in the Euchariſt, in regard of certayne pretended indignities thereupon enſuing, anſwered.

THe (1) Indignities which Prot. imagine to follow vpon the Real eating of Chriſts Body, are two: Firſt, that Chriſt ſhould be in continuall voyage of aſcending vp agayne to heauen, vpon the daily corruption of the formes of Bread and wyne. Secondly, he that ſhould paſſe into ſuch vndecent places, as mens ſtomackes &c. eaten by myce, burned by the fyre &c.

(1) Willet in his Synop. p. 454. See Algerus mentioning the like Obiections of the Heretickes of his tyme. l. 2. de Sacram. Euch. c. 1.

Concerning the firſt, it is explained by example of the ſoule being wholly in euery part of mans Body, the Compariſon is this; euen as when an arme or leg is cut off, the ſoule that informed that member before it was cut off, doth not

not periſh with it, for then he that lacked his arme ſhould looſe his ſoule; neyther doth it hang in the ayre, becauſe the ayre is not organized to receiue the information, but ceaſing to informe the member cut off, it doth without any motion to place, only looſe that ſubiect and place, keeping ſtill the place and reſidence in the Body where it was before: euen ſo the Body of Chriſt, when the formes of Bread and wine are corrupted in the ſtomake, doth without any motion frõ place to place only become abſent, or leaueth that aboad, which it had in the ſtomake, and keepeth the place which then, and before it had in heauen.

To the ſecond I anſwere, that as the Diuinity filleth all places how vndecent and vncleane ſoeuer; the Sunne beames alſo beating vpon a dunghill, and not defyled therewith; ſo Chriſts Body being immortall & impaſſible, cannot be defyled with the touch or impreſſion of any infection, or vncleane Creature. The ſtench of ſinne when ſhe cõuerſed vpon earth amongſt ſinners, did much more diſlike the ſmell of his ſoule, then this other could moleſt his Body. And as it was not vndecent, but a ſigne of great mercy and loue, that he ſhould ſuffer that; ſo it is not more vnſeemely, that his Body ſhould admit the other, ſeeing thereby he ſuffereth nothing, but only his remaining there to teſtify and worke admirable effectes of loue and Grace.

And heere for full'payment and anſwere to all theſe vile, baſe, groſſe and carnall Obiections of theſe Dunghill Heretickes; theſe Obiections and the like, are but raked out of the aſhes of the old Heathens and Pagans, of whom ſayth S. Auſtine. (2) *We ſhould not beleiue in Chriſt himſelfe, if we feared the laughing of Pagans.* They, & ſome ancient heretickes obiected the very like to this againſt the (3) Incarnation, Death, Paſſion, and Reſurrection of our glorious Sauiour, pretending that it was vndecent, that God (4) ſhould lye in a womans wombe nine monthes, that he ſhonld take vpon him the Priſon of our fleſh, that he ſhould indure the difficulties of our Infancy, ſhould be Circumciſed, & comming to mans ſtate, ſhould (5) ſuffer moſt ſhamefull and diſhonorable death; and all this becauſe Adam did taſt an Apple, the offence

(1) *Ep. 49. ad Deo-Gratias. q. 6.*
(2) *Tertul. de carne Chriſti. & l. de Reſur. carnis. Hier. Ep. ad Pamach. Euagrius hiſt. l. 1. c. 2. Theodor. l. 4. har. fab.*
(4) *Hilar. de Trin. l. 9. 11. 22. & l. cont. Conſtant.*
See Hook. Eccl. Pol. l. 4. Sect. 8. p. 183.
(5) See in Iuſtin Martyr. in Dial. cum Tryphone. Minutius Fælix in Octauio. And ſee the Centuriſts. Cent. 3. Col. 1310.

offence wherof, as the Heathens thought, god was more like to pardon, then thus to redeeme. And yet all this Christians firmely beliene.

Wherfore I will conclude this with the good aduise of S. Chrysostome, saying, (6) *Let vs alwaies beliene God, and not resist him, although, that which he sayth, may seeme absurd both to sense and thought &c. his wordes cannot deceiue vs, but our sense is easily deceiued &c. For so much therfore as he hath said, This is my Body, let vs in no sort doubt, but beliene.*

(6) In Mat. ho. 83.

SECT. X.

The foresaid truth of the Realt Presence of Christes Body and Bloud in the Blessed Sacrament, is further proued by cleere and confessed Miracles, wrought by God in testimony therof.

SInce the stumbling blocke of pretended impossibility & absurdity conceined against our Doctrine, and wherat flesh and bloud hath taken such scruple and offence, is by that which hitherto hath bene alleadged, so cleerly remoued, and that this matter is now at last confessed to be possible, as depending only vpon Gods holy will: Since likewise his will, which cannot be better knowne to vs, then by his word, is herin made so plaine vnto vs, euen by his written word, that if Protestants would but for the tyme suppose, that the holy Ghost were mindfull and desirous to decree by Scripture the Realt Presence, themselues can hardly imagine wordes more euident to that purpose, then are these, *This is my Body which is giuen for you*, which as Reinolds (1) granteth, *are plainer in shew for our Realt Presence, then for their Sacramentall*: Since also the answerable sense of the same wordes is accordingly confirmed to vs, not only by our Sauiours forsaid promise, *The bread which I will giue is my flesh*, as also by S. Paules agreable Explication, whom sundry Protestantes confesse herin (2) to be Christes best *interpreter*: and likewise by the confessed testimonies of the Primitiue

(1) Confer. with Hart. p. 68.
(1) Calu. in Ep. 153. p. 662. Whitak. cont. Dur. l. 2. p. 188. Hook. Eccl. Pol. l. 5. p. 176.

mitiue Church, which according to Prot. (3) *is the true and beſt Miſtres of Poſterity*, but euen alſo by the Doctrine and beliefe of Prot. themſelues, who enforced through the Euidence of truth, haue taught and maintayned the ſame Real Preſence: heereof Luther himſelfe ſhall giue vs a plaine teſtimony, (4) *That I cannot, nor will not deny* (ſayth he) *that of Carolaſtadius, or any other could for the laſt fiue yeares haue perſuaded me that there had beene nothing in the Sacrament but bread and wine, he ſhould haue bound me vnto him by a great good turne: for I haue taken great care in the diſcuſſion of this matter, and haue endeauoured with all my power, and ſinewes ſtretched out, to be rid thereof, for I did well ſee, that thereby I might very greatly hurt the Papacy &c. But I do ſee my ſelfe captiue, no way being left to eſcape, for the Text of the Ghoſpell is ſo plaine and ſtrong &c.*

(3) Confeſſ. of Bohemia, in the Harm of Confeſſ. p. 400.

(4) *In Briſſ. ad Argenti. menſes.*

Theſe ſo conuincing proofes thus premiſed, I will now conclude this Controuerſy with onely adding thereto in further Confirmation to vs of Gods holy will in this behalfe, ſome few, of many vndoubted miracles, reported eyther by Ancient Fathers, or Prot. themſelues. Paulus Diaconus *in vitaS. Gregorij*, reporteth that, when S. Gregory to perſuade an incredulous woman in the Real Preſence, had, *after prayer made, ſound the little portion of the* (Sacramentall) *Bread, which he had placed on the Aultar, to be made fleſh, he ſayd to the woman, learne, and now beliene him witneſſing &c. my Bloud is truly drinke.* This Hiſtory is alſo related and acknowledged by D. (5) Humfrey, and inſteed of better anſwer is only deryded. S. Ambroſe reporteth, that, (6) *His brother Satyrus being by ſhipwracke throwne into the Sea, and hauing tyed the diuine Sacrament in a ſtole, and faſtened the ſtole about his necke, ſought no boarde wherby ſupported, he might be holpen, but thinking himſelfe therewith ſufficiently defended, required no other helpe: neyther did his hope leaue him, nor his opinion deceiue him, but being the firſt that was ſaued from the water, he was ſet ſafe on ſhore &c.* This is ſo certaine, that Peter (7) Martyr and Whitaker acknowledging the matter of fact, inſteed of better anſwer, reproue both S. Ambroſe, and his Brother Satyrus. S. Cyprian reporteth concerning (8) *a certaine woman who when ſhe would with vnworthy hands haue opened her Coffer, wherein was* (reſerued)

(5) *Ieſuit. part. 2. rat. 5. p. 618.*

(6) *Orat. Funeb. de obitu Frat. Satyri.*

(7) *Lib. cont. Gardin. Obiect. 88. Whitak. lib. 10. cont. Dur. p 872.*

(8) *Ser. de laſſis.*

ſerued) *the holy thing of our Lord, there ſprung vp fire from thence, whereby she was ſo terrifyed, that she durſt not touch it.* Fulke acknowledging this fact, only anſwereth that, (9) *This was a iuſt punishment for her reſeruing of that which should haue beene receyued*: but S. Cyprian ſayth, ſhe was puniſhed, for that *she would haue touched it with vnworthy hands.*

(9) Againſt Heskins &c. P. 525.

But now to relate ſome miraculous apparitions of Bloud iſſuing from the Sacrament vpon the Iewes miſbeliefe or violence offered thereto: S. Baſil miniſtring the Sacrament, a Iew being preſent, and behoulding the Bread and wyne, laughed at the ſacred Myſteries of Chriſtians, which S. Baſil perceiuing, offered both to be eaten, but they preſently appeared to be fleſh and bloud. This is related by Cyrus (10) Theodorus Prodomius, who liued Anno 440. and by the (11) Century writers.

(10) *In Epigram. in D. Baſilium.*

(11) *Cent. 4. Col. 431.*

In like ſort ſundry writers relate that, (12) *In February 1510. in a towne called Knobloch, one Paul, a Sacrilegious perſon, went ſecretly into the Church by night, broke the Pixe where the Sacrament was reſerued, and ſtole from thence two conſecrated hoſts, one of which he ſould to a Iew: afterward the Iew blinded with malice ſayd, If thou be the God of Chriſtians manifeſt thy ſelfe, & that ſayd, he pierced the Sacrament with his dagger, whereupon bloud did miraculouſly iſſue forth &c.* This miracle was ſo knowne & diſcouered, that *thirty eight Iewes aſſenting thereto, were thereſore apprehended, and publickly burned the 19. of July 1510. in the Marchie of Brandeburge; and all Iewes were alſo thereupon by publicke Decree banished out of the ſayd Territories.* This hiſtory is ſo certayne, that it is reported by the Prot. writers, Manlius, Beuther, and Oſiander. And ſundry other (13) ſuch lyke might be produced, ſo free from all ſuſpition of fiction, that the very tyme in which they happened, is ſpecially deſcribed, the place particularly named, the numbers of the Offenders noted, and their publicke condemnation and execution euen to death, certainly ſet downe, and the offence in all theſe diſcouered, vpon occaſion of aſtoniſhment at the miracle ſhewed.

(12) *Surius in Chron. Nicol. Baſilius in additione ad Chronicon Nauclerj. Pontanus l. 5. rerum memorabilium.*

(13) See Breerley his Liturgy of the Maſſe. 287.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXII.

The true State of the Queſtion, concerning the Communion of the Laity, vnder one, or both kinds.

Whether vnder eyther kind of the Euchariſt, the Body and Bloud of Chriſt our Sauiour are truly contayned, and the true Eſſence of the Sacrament preſerued; and conſequently whether it be lawfull to adminiſter the Sacrament only vnder one kind vnto the Laity: or that, Chriſt hath commanded both kinds to be adminiſtred vnto them?

SECT. I.

Catholike Doctrine.

THE preſent Controuerſy is not, whether Chriſt did inſtitute the Euchariſt vnder both kindes, or whether himſelfe did adminiſter the ſame in both to his Apoſtles, or whether the Apoſtles, or the Biſhops of the Primitiue Church, did in like manner at ſundry tymes practiſe the ſame; for all this the Catholicke Church doth willingly graunt: But the mayne point in Controuerſy is, whether Chriſt did Commaund the Adminiſtration of both

kindes to the Laity, and whether the Essence of this Sacrament be entyre in one, and the same Grace necessary to saluation giuen to the Receiuers by one, as both. Now, in this Case, the Catholicke Church declareth and decreeth that, (1) *Alwaies this beliefe was in the Church of God, that immediatly after Consecration, the true Body of our Lord, and his true Bloud, together with his Soule and Diuinity, are vnder the forme of Bread and wyne; but the Body truly vnder the forme of Bread, and the Bloud vnder the forme of wyne, by vertue of the wordes; and the Body vnder the forme of wyne, and the Bloud vnder the forme of Bread, and the Soule vnder both, by vertue of that natural connexion, and concomitancie, wherby the partes of Christ our Lord, who is now risen from the dead to dye no more, are coupled amongst themselues: and the Diuinity also, for that admirable hypostaticall vnion therof, with the Body, and the Soule. Wherfore it is most true, that as much is contayned vnder either kind as vnder both, for whole and entyre Christ is vnder the forme of Bread, and vnder euery part of the forme, whole also vnder the forme of wyne, and the partes therof.* Hereupon it doth further decree that, (2) *the Laickes, and Clerkes not celebrating, are bound by no diuine Precept, to receiue the Sacrament of the Eucharist vnder both kindes; neither by any meanes can it be doubted with a safe faith, but that the Communion vnder one kind sufficeth them to saluation: for although Christ our Lord instituted this venerable Sacrament, in his last Supper, vnder the kinds of Bread and wyne, and deliuered it vnto his Apostles: yet notwithstanding, that institution and deliuery tend not to this, that all faithfull Christians be bound by Decree of our Lord to receiue both kindes. But neither out of those wordes of Iohn the sixt is it rightly deduced, that the Communion vnder both kindes is commanded by our Lord, howsoeuer it be vnderstood according to diuers Interpretations of holy Fathers and Doctours: for be that said, Vnlesse you eate the flesh of the Sonne of Man, and drinke his Bloud, you shall not haue lyfe in you; said also, If any man shall eate of this Bread he shall liue for euer. And he who said, Whosoeuer eateth my flesh and drinketh my Bloud, hath eternall lyfe; said also, The Bread which I will giue is my flesh for the life of the world. And to conclude, he who said, He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my Bloud, abydeth in me & I in him; said neuertheless, He that eateth this Bread shall liue for euer.*

(1) Concil. Trident. Sess. 13. Cap. 3.

(2) Concil. Trident. Sess. 21. Cap. 2.

Further-

Furthermore (3) it declareth, this power euer to haue bene in the Church, that in the diſpenſing of the Sacramentes, their ſubſtance preſerued, the might ordayne, or change thoſe thinges, which the iudged more expedient for the profit of the receiuers, or the reuerence of the Sacraments themſelues, according to the variety of thinges, tymes, and places &c. Wherfore knowing this her authority in the Adminiſtration of Sacramentes, although from the beginning of Chriſtian Religion, the vſe of both kindes was not rare; yet in proceſſe of tyme, that cuſtome being changed in many places, moued with great and iuſt Cauſes, ſhe hath approued this Cuſtome of Communicating vnder one kind, and hath Decreed that it is to be houlden for a law; which it is not lawfull to reiect, or at pleaſure to change without the authority of the Church it ſelfe. And (4) therfore, if any man ſhall ſay; that all and ſingular Chriſtians by Gods Comandement or neceſſity of Saluation, ought to receiue the Sacrament of the Euchariſt vnder both kindes &c. Or (5) that the holy Catholicke Church hath not bene moued for iuſt cauſes and reaſons, that the Laickes, and alſo the Clerkes not celebrating, might not be communicated only vnder the forme of Bread, or that ſhe erred therin &c. Or (6) if any ſhall deny, whole and entyre Chriſt, the fountaine and author of all graces, to be taken vnder the one kind of Bread becauſe as ſome falſly affirme, he is not receyued according to the Inſtitution of Chriſt himſelfe vnder both kinds, let him be accurſed. Thus cleerly and particularly hath the Councell of Trent determined this Controuerſy.

(1) Seſſ. 22. Cap. 2.

(4) Can. 2.

(5) Can. 2.

(6) Can. 3.

It is defyned by the Councell of Conſtance, That (7) ſeeing in ſome partes of the world ſome preſume rashly to affirme, that Chriſtian people ought to receiue the holy Sacrament of the Euchariſt vnder both kindes of Bread and wyne, and do not only in many places communicate the Lay people vnder the forme of Bread, but alſo vnder the forme of wyne euen after Supper, or otherwiſe not faſting &c. Hence it is, that this preſent Councell &c. doth defyne, that although Chriſt did inſtitute thi venerable Sacrament after Supper and gaue it to his Diſciples vnder both kindes of Bread and wyne, yet this notwithſtanding the laudable authority of Sacred Canons, and the approued Cuſtome of the Church hath and doth obſerue, that this Sacrament ought not to be Conſecrated after ſupper, nor receiued by the people not faſting but in the Caſe of infirmity or other neceſſity granted or admitted by the law of the Church. And as this Cuſtome for the auoy-

(7) Seſſ 14.

ding of some dangers and scandals, was iustly brought in, that though in the Primitiue Church this Sacrament was receiued by the faithfull vnder both kindes, yet afterwards it should be receiued, by those that Consecrate, vnder both, and by the Laity only vnder the forme of Bread, seeing it is firmely to be beleiued, and no wayes to be doubted, that the whole Body, and Bloud of Christ is truly contained, aswell vnder the forme of Bread, as vnder the forme of wyne: wherfore seeing this Custome was rightly brought in by the Church and holy Fathers, & hath bene very long obserued, it is to be houlden for a law, which it is not lawfull to reiect, or at pleasure to alter, without the authority of the Church. And the same is Decreed by the Councell (8) of Basil. The Councell of Florence declared, and that with the assent of the Armenians, that, (9) *By vertue of the wordes, the substance of Bread, is turned into the Body of Christ, and the substance of the wyne into his Bloud, yet so as Christ is contayned whole vnder the forme of Bread, and whole vnder the forme of wyne, as also whole vnder euery part of the host consecrated, and the wyne consecrated, separation being made.* The selfesame which these Councels haue Decreed, is generally taught, beleiued, and practised by all (10) Catholickes.

(8) Siss. 30.
(9) In Decret. Eugenij PP. 4.
(10) Bellar. de Euchar. l. 4. c. 21. &c. Rhem. Test. in Ioan. 6.

Protestant Vntruthes.

Luther very impudently and falsly sayth, (11) *I regard not the Councell of Constance, whose authority if it be of force, why is not that of Basil of force also, which Decreeth to the contrary, that it was lawfull for the Bohemians to receiue both kinds.* But this is vntrue, for the same thing was decreed in both (12) Councels, to wit, That the Laity were not bound by any diuine Precept, to receiue vnder both kinds, and therfore the law and Custome of the Church to be obserued: And though the Councell of Basil did allow the Bohemians to receiue vnder both kindes, yet it was but vpon their acknowledgmēt, that it was granted them by the Church, and that they were not obliged therto by any Diuine law.

(11) De Captiuit. Babyl. c. 1. de Euchar.
(12) Conc. Constant. Sess. 13. Basile. Sess 30.

Pro-

Proteſtant Doctrine.

The Engliſh Prot. Church decreeth that, (13) *The Cup of the Lord is not to be denyed to the Lay people, for both the parties of the Lords Sacrament by Chriſtes Ordinance, and Commandement, ought to be miniſtred to all Chriſtian men alike.* And the ſame is taught by (14) Luther, Caluin, and ſundry others. In ſo much, that if you will believe M. Morton, (15) *All Proteſtants, whether you call them Caluiniſts, or Lutherans, hould that in the publick and ſet Celebration of the Eucharist, the Communion in both kinds ought to be given to all ſortes of Communicants that are capable of both.*

(13) *Article* 30.

(14) *De formula Miſſæ. Cal. Inſtit l. 4. c. 17. ſect. 47. Chemnit. Exam part. 2. Seſſ. 11.*

(15) Of the Inſtitution &c. or Maſſe of Chriſt l. 1. c. 3. ſect. 1.

Proteſtants agree with Ancient Hereticks.

Vrbanus Rhegius a Proteſtant writer, acknowledgeth that the Hereticke *Neſtorius* (16) *communicated the Laity vnder both kinds,* (but) *the Councell of Epheſus withſtood him.*

Peter (17) Dreſdenſis, and Iacobel Miſnenſis taught, that the lay people could not be ſaued, vnles they drunke of the Cup of our Lord. Iohn Huſſe taught, (18) The neceſſity of Communion vnder both kinds.

(16) *Loc. com. fol. 58.*

(17) *Æneas Siluius Hiſt. Bohem. c. 35.*

(18) *Act. Mon. p. 160. Dreſſerus in Millan. 6. p. 255.*

Proteſtants Errours.

Luthers obſtinate pryde was ſuch, as that he affirmed, that, (19) *If any Councell ſhould ordayne or permit both kinds, we would not vſe both, but in deſpite of the Councell and the Decree therof, we would either vſe one or neither, and not both, accuſing all who through the power and decree of the Councell ſhould vſe both.* And, It is (20) *not determined according to the ſpirit of truth, nor by the authority of Scriptures, but by the pipe of the Pope, according to the vaine Traditions of men, the Eſſence of God not to beget, nor to be begotten, the ſoule to be the ſubſtantiall forme of the Body, bread and wyne to be tranſubſtantiated vpon the Aultar, one only forme to be giuen to the laity for the whole Sacramēt, & ſuch like mōſters.* Who but a Mōſter in religion would cenſure Articles of faith to be Monſters?

(19) *In formula Miſſæ.*

(20) *Tom. 2. in pſ. 22. fol. 148.*

SECT. II.

That vnder eyther kind is contayned whole Christ, to wit, Body, Bloud, Soule & Diuinity: as also the true Essence of the Sacrament.

THE proofe of the first point, of Christ being whole in eyther kind, is drawne from three Principles of fayth: first that by reason of those words of Christ, This is my body which shalbe giuen for you, that in the Eucharist is truly & really the very body of Christ. The second, that Christ our Sauiour after his Resurrection from death was neuer to dye agayne according to those wordes of S. Paul, (1) *Christ rising agayne from the dead, now dyeth no more, Death shall no more haue Dominion ouer him:* whence it necessarily followeth, that vnder the forme of Bread is not the Body of Christ without Bloud and Soule, for so it should be without life, and cõsequently dead. The third, that Christ is one diuine person subsisting in two natures, from whence it immediatly arryseth, that since the Body of Christ hath no other subsistence then that of his Godhead, which really is all one with his Essence, that therefore wheresoeuer his Body is, there is also his Diuinity. This argument supposing these 3. principles doth euidẽtly conuince; & for the two later I doubt not but most Prot. will admit; and the first is acknowledged for true by all Lutherans, and hath beene already proued.

(1) Rom. 6. 9.

Secondly, the same is proued by those words of our Sauiour, (2) *He that eateth me, the same also shall liue by me.* Now, Christ is not eaten but vnder the forme of Bread, therefore vnder that forme is not only his sacred Body, but his blessed Soule, and precious Bloud, euen whole Christ: for of his Body only he would neuer haue sayd, *he that eateth me*; and *I am the bread of lyfe which descended from heauen*; And againe, *This is the Bread which descended from heauen.*

(2) Io. 6. 57.

Touching the second point, viz. that the true Essence of the Sacrament is found in eyther kind, it is proued; for in

a

a Sacrament is only required that it be a ſigne and cauſe of Grace. The ſigne in the Euchariſt, as it is a Sacrament, is twofold: the firſt of internall refection, according to thoſe wordes of Chriſt, (3) *My flesh is truly meate*; the ſecond of perfect vnion of the faythfull among themſelues, and with Chriſt, whereof S. Paul ſpeaketh, ſaying, (4) *for being many we are one Bread, one Body, all that participate of one Bread.* Now, both theſe ſignifications are found in eyther kind; for firſt, ſpirituall refection only importeth the refection of the ſoule, which whether it be by way of meate or drinke, or both importeth not, ſeeing in ſpirituall refections, one and the ſelfe-ſame thing is ſayd to be meate and drinke. For example, of of Iuſtice our Sauiour ſayth, (5) *Bleſſed are they who hunger & thirſt Iuſtice, for they ſhalbe filled.* Like wiſe of wiſdome the wiſeman ſayth, (6) *They that eate me ſhall yet hunger, and they that drinke me ſhall yet thirſt:* wherefore as our Sauiour ſayd, *my flesh is truly meate and my Bloud is truly drinke*, ſo alſo in the ſame place he ſayd, *he that eateth this Bread ſhall liue for euer.* And, *he that eateth me ſhall liue by me.*

(3) Io. 6. 55.
(4) 1. Cor. 10. 17.
(5) Mat. 5. 6.
(6) Eccleſ. 24. 29.

Concerning the ſecond ſignification of the Vnion of the faythfull among themſelues, it is expreſſed by many graynes of Corne wrought togeather, by making Bread thereof with flower and water, as S. (7) Cyprian teſtifyeth, and the like may be ſhewed of the wine compoſed of many grapes, and mingled with water in the Chalice. And as for the cauſe of Grace requiſite in a Sacrament, it is found in eyther kind, for it is Chriſt, Cauſe and Authour of all Sacraments, and of Grace thereby giuen, who vnder eyther forme is whole & entire, as hath beene before proued. Neither doth it heerupon follow, that becauſe the Sacrament is Eſſentially contayned vnder eyther kind, that therefore the Prieſt receiuing vnder both, receyueth two Sacramentes, for being receyued both at once they make but one, as being ordayned to one refection, ſignifying one thing, and producing one effect: euen as ſixe or ſeauen diſhes of meat ſet vpō a Table, do but make one dinner, whereas part thereof being but ſerued one day, and the reſt another, they would make two. And the reaſon why Prieſts receiue vnder both kinds, is becauſe they offer vp a Sacrifice, which repreſenteth

(7) L. 2. Ep. 3. ad Cæcil.

teth the Sacrifice of Christ vpon the Crosse, which were not perfectly represented but by both kinds, for the only forme of Bread would not represent Christ, as dead, without some signe of bloud, nor the only forme of wyne would sufficiently represent him as sacrificed, seeing only wyne is not an host, or thing to be sacrificed: wherefore also in this sort was it prefigured in the Sacrifice of Melchisedech, offering vp both Bread and wyne.

Hauing thus proued the Premisses, viz. That whole Christ is contained vnder eyther kind, and the true essence of the Sacrament: from hence it directly followeth, that neither irreuerence is offered to the Sacrament, it not being (as is obiected) giuen halfe or maymed, but essentially whole; nor iniury to the people by depriuing them of any Grace necessary to Saluation, seeing the very fountayne of Grace is no lesse receiued vnder eyther kind, then vnder both.

By these premisses it is euident, that if we respect the nature of the thing, no obligation or necessity ariseth of receiuing both kinds: the only question therefore remayning is, Whether therto we be bound by any Precept of Christ, whereof I will treat in the next Section.

SECT. III.

That Christ our Sauiour, gaue no Command of Receyuing vnder both kinds, it is proued by the sacred Scriptures, and by his owne, and his blessed Apostles Examples.

THough in this question it belongeth to our Aduersaries to proue, and to vs only to answere, they affirming and we denying, yet in more full demonstrance of the truth, I will alledge sundry reasons, in proofe that Christ our Sauiour gaue no Commandement of receyuing vnder both kinds. And first, as there were figures, which did represent this Sacrament vnder both kinds; so also there were

others

others which did represent it vnder one only, as the *Paschal Lambe*: for the bloud which was sprinkled vpon the Postes, did not prefigure the Bloud in the Chalice, but (as Ancient (1) Fathers teach) the signe of the Crosse, for that bloud was not drunke, nor giuen to others, but the Postes were sprinkled therewith, and that before the Lambe was eaten; besides, in the old Sacrifices, those things which were liquid, belonged only to Priests, the lay people vsing, or requiring no part thereof. So also *Manna* was giuen without drinke, for though S. Paul sayth, (2) *All did eate the same spirituall food, and all drunke the same spirituall drinke*, yet they were two distinct figures, and giuen at diuers tymes; *Manna* being giuen in the (3) Desart *Sin*, and afterwards water from the Rock (4) *Raphidim*: and so our Sauiour (5) comparing *Manna* with the Eucharist, maketh yet no mention of water.

(1) *Aug. l. 12. cons. Faust. c. 30. Hier. in c. 66. Isaiæ. Cyp. in Tract. cont. Demetr. Isidor. in c. 12. Exod.*
(2) *1. Cor. 10. v. 4.*
(3) *Exod. 16. 14.*
(4) *Exod. 17. 1.*
(5) *Io. 6.*

Secondly, as our Sauiour sometymes doth mention both kinds, so also often he mentioneth but one, as (6) *He that eateth me, the same also shall liue by me: This is the Bread that came downe from heauen*, (7) *he that eateth this bread shall liue for euer*, and the like.

(6) *Io. 6. 49.*
(7) *Io. 6. 57. 58.*

Thirdly, the practise of our Sauiour is the best witnes of his Doctrine. S. Luke relateth of him, that being at supper with two of his Disciples at Emaus, *he tooke Bread and blessed, and brake, and did reach to them*, by which Bread is vnderstood the Eucharist, not only by S. (8) Austine and the other Fathers, but euen by Prot. (9) writers, and yet he maketh heere no mention of wyne, or of the Cup, but rather by the words and circumstances, of the want thereof, for it is sayd, (10) *And it came to passe, whilest he sate at the table with them, he tooke bread, and blessed, and brake, and did reach to them, and their eyes were opened, and they knew him, and he vanished out of their sight*; so ioyning to the reaching of the Bread, and their knowing him, his vanishing away, not leauing any tyme for the Benediction and Consecration of the Chalice.

(8) *Lib. 3. de consensu c. 25. Author operis imperfecti in Mat. ho. 17. Hieron. Epitaph. Paulæ. Beda & Theophil. in hunc locum Lucæ.*
(9) *Melanct. Apol. confess. August. in Art. de vtraque specie.*
(10) *Luc. 24. 30. See Act. 2 42.*

Fouthly, in like sort also was the practise of the Apostles after Christes tyme. For S. Luke speaking of the fayth-

full, affirmeth. (11) *That they were perſeuering in the Doctrine of the Apoſtles, & in the Communication of the breaking of Bread*; where alſo by breaking of Bread is vnderſtood the Euchariſt, aſwel in that it is ioyned with Doctrine and Prayer, as alſo in that it had beene rather a diſpraiſe then praiſe, to report of the faythfull, that they were perſeuering in corporall dinners and uppers: and ſo alſo is it vnderſtood by (12) Fathers and (13) Proteſtant writers; and yet neyther heere is there made any mention of wyne, or the Cup.

(11) *Act.* 2. 42.

(12) *Author operis imperf. in Mat. hom.* 17. *Beda in* 1. *c. Act.*

Beſides there were many Chriſtians in Hieruſalem, whome in thoſe beginnings, the Apoſtles did permit in ſome things to (14) Iudaize, amongſt whome were the (15) Nazarits, who drunke no wine, nor ſhaued their heads, vntill the tyme that their vowes were expired; now, it is not credible, that thoſe drunke againſt their vow, nor probable that they altogeather abſtained from Communion, ſeeing S. Luke ſayth, *they were perſeuering &c.*

(13) *Luther ſer. de Euch. Calu. l.* 4. *Iohn. Chem. in Exam. Conc. Trid. Sſſ.* 21. *part.* 2. *examinis.*

(14) *Act.* 21. 24. 26.

(15) *Num.* 6. 3. 4. 5. 18.

Fifthly, many in hoat Countries do abſtaine from wine from their Childhood, and eyther by nature or education do abſtaine and abhorre it ſo much, as they cannot endure to taſt it. Alſo in ſome Countries wine is ſo ſcarce, and ſo deere, as that ſufficient cannot be prouided for all the people: To theſe and ſundry ſuch inconueniences, it is not probable that the All-ſeeing wiſdome of God would bynd vs.

To Anſwere with Chemnitius, that by breaking of bread, is vnderſtood alſo the giuing of the Chalice, by *Synecdoche*, by the Part vnderſtanding the Whole, this I ſay is inſufficient, as being an anſwere only imaginary, and not grounded, & ſuch, as by the like liberty any doctrine though neuer ſo impious or abſurd, might eaſily be maintayned, againſt all Scripture though neuer ſo plaine. Neither is it any thing confirmed by affirming, that if the Chalice be not vnderſtood, that then would follow therof, that the Apoſtles did but Conſecrate vnder one kind, which yet Catholickes do not admit: for S. Luke doth not ſet downe what the Apoſtles did, but what the people did, and therfore they might Conſecrate vnder both, though they did adminiſter vnto the people only vnder one.

SECT.

SECT. IV.

That Communion vnder one, or both kinds being a thing indifferent, the Church might lawfully determine the ſame: And of the reaſons that moued the Church in limitation therof.

ALthough we were not thus ſtored with ſuch plentifull and pregnant prooſes, as in ſundry other high myſteries of our faith we are not, nor with reaſon can expect; yet the Doctrine of the vniuerſall Church, inſpired by the holy Ghoſt, and made knowne vnto vs by the abſolute and infallible Decrees of Sundry Generall Councels, might ſufficiently ſerue to free the vnderſtanding of any man from Error, or his Conſcience from ſinne; for it may not be auouched without great temerity, either that ſhe ſhould ſo haynouſly treſpaſſe againſt the ſacred Lawes of her deareſt Spouſe, or ſo vnnaturally or vncharitably depriue her owne Children of neceſſary bleſſings and helps bequeathed vnto them; yea in the end it ſhould redound to the blemiſh of Chriſt himſelfe, if he ſhould ſuffer his Church ſo daungerouſly to erre, in a matter of that moment, and that cleane contrary to ſo many promiſes made vnto her, of his directing and continuall aſſiſtance, by his ſpirit, and leading into all truth.

Wherfore in this our preſent Controuerſy we are to aſſume, that the Catholicke Church only, expreſſeth that power which ſhe euer had, to wit, in diſpenſing of the Sacraments, their ſubſtance or eſſence preſerued, to ordaine or alter whatſoeuer ſhe ſhall iudge more expedient for the profit of the receyners, or reuerence of the Sacrament, according to the variety of things, tymes, and places: which her Authority the Apoſtle ſeemeth not obſcurely to inſinuate, when he ſaid, (1) *So let a man eſteeme vs as the Miniſters of Chriſt, and the diſpenſers of the Myſteries of God*: and himſelfe to haue vſed this power, it is manifeſt, both in many other thinges, as al-

(1) 1. Cor. 4.

ſo in this Sacrament, when hauing ordayned ſome things concerning the vſe therof, (2) *the reſt* (ſayth he) *I will diſpoſe when I come.* Chriſt our Sauiour ſaid to his Apoſtles, (3) *Going, teach you all Nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the ſonne, and of the holy Ghoſt*, and yet the Church commandeth Infantes to be baptized, who are not capable of teaching. In like ſort the Church hath lawfully decreed, (4) certaine impediments of mariage, which yet neither the law of nature, nor any poſitiue diuine law exacted. And not only in the Sacramentes, but alſo in other things hath the Church vpon iuſt occaſions exerciſed her ſaid authority, by reducing things of their owne nature indifferent, to be matter of precept and neceſſity: ſo the Apoſtles themſelues impoſed vpon the Gentiles for a tyme a new Law of abſtinence (5) *from the things immolated to Idols, and blond, and that which is ſtrangled &c.* Which yet Chriſt himſelfe had neuer impoſed, but left the eating of them a matter indifferent; wheras after the Apoſtles Decree, the ſaid eating had bene ſinne, and abſtinence neceſſary, as is manifeſt by thoſe wordes, (6) *It ſeemeth good to the holy Ghoſt and to vs, to lay no further burthen vpon you then theſe neceſſary things, that ye abſtaine from things immolated to Idols &c.* And ſo of S. Paul it is ſaid, *that he* (7) *walked through Syria and Cilicia confirming the Churches, commanding them to keep the Preceptes of the Apoſtles and Ancients.* And in the Primitiue Church it was not only thought (8) vnlawfull to violate the ſaid Law, but alſo ſeuere puniſhment was inflicted vpon the (9) tranſgreſſors therof; yea there hath ſcarce bene any Councell in the Church of God, which hath not commãded or forbidden vnder ſinne ſome thing, which before the ſaid Councell was free and indifferent: wherfore Communion vnder one or both kinds, being proued and acknowledged to be a thing of indifferency, the Church in fulnes of her power, might lawfully permit or limit the ſame, and yet her Decree once paſt, the violating therof is vndoubtedly ſinne. So S. Bernard ſaith, (10) *Although the quality of the worke inioyned of it ſelfe be free from fault, yet the waight of authority adioyned, maketh it ſubiect to Command, and the Commandement ſubiect to ſinne.* Yea D. Whiteguift teacheth

(1) 1. Cor. 11. 34.
(3) Mat. 28. 19.
(4) See S. Aug. l. 15. de Ciuit. c. 16. Ambr. Ep. 66. ad Patern. Greg. l. 12. Regiſt. Ep. 31 ad Faluc.
(5) Act. 15. 29.
(6) Act. 15. 28. 29.
(7) Act. 15. 41. & 16. 4.
(8) Tertul. in Apol. c. 9. Orig. l. 8. cont. Celſum. Cyril. Catech. 5. Auguſt. Ep. 154. Leo Epiſt. 79. c. 5. Concil. Gang. c. 2.
(9) Can. Apoſt. c. 62. Concil 2. Aurel. can. 19. 20.
(10) De præcepto & diſpenſ.

cheth that, (11) *Things indifferent of themſelues, do after a ſort change their nature, when by ſome Commandement they are commanded or forbidden.* And, *they remayne* (12) *indifferent, till the Church hath taken order in them, which being done they are no more indifferent.* With him agreeth Beza affirming that, (13) *Things of themſelues indifferent, do in a manner change their natures when they are Commanded, or forbidden by any lawfull Commend.* Yea ſaith M. Powell, (14) *Such indifferent things, as by the Church haue bene lawfully and orderly inſtituted and approued, are ſo far humane, as that they are alſo diuine, and therfore haue more then humane authority, yea plainly diuine &c. Therfore the Precepts of the Church in things indifferent, are both true and holy:* and conſequently ſeeing the Church hath determined, receiuing of the Sacrament to be vnder one kind which was formerly indifferent, it is now vnder ſinne accordingly to be vſed, and obſerued.

(11) Defence &c. p. 118.
(12) Ib. p. 91.
(13) Ep. Theol. Ep. 14. p. 181.
(14) Of things indifferent. p. 7.

Now, the reaſons mouing the Church to the teſtaſirt therof were many and forcible, as firſt to preuent therby the Occaſion of Errour: for wheras in the beginning of the Church the vſe of one or both kinds was indifferent, as may be ſhewed in Condemnation of the Manichees, (15) who abſtained from wyne, as a thing of it ſelfe vnlawfull, holy Biſhops hereupon did much commend the vſe of the Chalice: but this errour being extinguiſhed, and another ariſing againſt the integrity of Chriſt (16) vnder either kind, as alſo touching the abſolute neceſſity of both; the Church of God herupon began more vniuerſally to practiſe the Communion vnder one, and withall in declaration of the truth & preuention of ſchiſme and ſcandall, did abſolutly Decree the lawfulnes therof, with prohibition of the contrary: ſo in ancient times when the Ebionites taught vnleuened bread to be neceſſary in Conſecration of the Euchariſt, the Church Commanded Conſecration to be made in leuened bread: And when the Hereticke Neſtorius denied our B. Lady to be the Mother of God, and only to be called the Mother of Chriſt, the Church condemned him, and commanded the contrary: ſo that no courſe hath euer bene found more effectuall for confutation and vtter extirpation of errour & he-

(15) See Aug. l. de hær. c. 46. Leo ſer. 4 de Quadrag. Chemnit. Exam. part. 2. p. 141. Zepperus de Sacram. p. 42. Morton's Appeal. l. 2. c. 4. p. 139.
(16) Æneas Siluius hiſt. Bohem. c. 35.

reſie, then by contrary Decrees to declare and eſtabliſh the truth.

A ſecond reaſon mouing the Church, was the deſerued reuerence of this higheſt Sacrament, in due Conſideration wherof, the holy Fathers (17) did carefully preſcribe moſt diligent care to be vſed, leaſt any litle particle of the Hoſt, or drop of the Chalice, ſhould fall vpon the ground. Now the multitude of Chriſtians being very great, and their negligence in ſacred things, through want of zeale & Deuotion notorious, it could not morally be poſſible, but that frequent ſpilling of the Bloud would happen, if the Chalice were ordinarily to be giuen to the people, of which (18) prophanations ouer frequent experience hath bene had.

(17) *Aug. l. 3. ho. 26. ho. 25. Cyril. Catech. 5. Miſtag. Orig. ho. 13. in Exod.*

(18) *Æneas Siluius Ep. 13. de errore Bohem. & narratio de Bohemis ad Conc. Baſil.*

SECT. V.

That the Ancient Fathers do expound the Scriptures in Confirmation of the lawfulnes of the Adminiſtration of the bleſſed Sacrament vnder one kind.

S. Auſtine writing by occaſion vpon the forſaid place of S. Luke, ſayth. (1) *Something hapned to the eies of them that went to Emaus, which is permitted ſo to remaine, vntill the breaking of Bread, for the reaſon of a certaine myſtery, that another forme might be ſhewed vnto them in that Bread, and ſo they ſhould not know him but in the breaking of Bread, as it is euident by S. Luke his narration &c. And it is not amiſſe if we vnderſtand, that this impediment was cauſed in their eyes by Sathan, leaſt Ieſus ſhould be acknowledged; but yet the permiſsion was wrought by Chriſt vntill the Sacrament of bread: that the vnity of his Body participated, the impediment of the Enemy might be remoued, that Chriſt might be acknowledged.* Againe, (2) *O Brethren where would our Lord be knowne? In the breaking of Bread, we are ſecure, we breake bread, and do acknowledge our Lord. He would not haue bene knowne there but for vs, who were not to ſee him in flesh, and yet we were to eate his flesh.*

(1) *De conſenſu Euang. l. 3. c. 25. & Ep. 59. ad Paulin. Beda & Theophil. in hunc locum.*

(2) *Serm. de temp. 140.*

Ionas Aurelianenſis writeth thus, (3) *In the Actes of the Apoſtles, the Apoſtles are read to haue taught euery day in the Temple, and*

(3) *Lib. 3. de Imag.*

and at their houſes, and to haue celebrated the Miſteries of our Lords Body in the breaking of Bread. The Chriſtians in Syria inſteed of reading, *in Communion, and breaking of Bread*, in their Syriacke text read, *in the breaking of the Euchariſte*, which proueth this place to be vnderſtood not of Common bread, but of the Euchariſt.

(4) L. 2. de Eccleſ. c. 2. p. 411.

Andreas Friccius ſayth, (4) *Chriſt at his laſt Supper ioyned wyne with bread: if therfore the Church ſeparate theſe, ſhe is not to be heard: the Church of Hieruſalem did ſeparate theſe. S Iames (as ſome doe affirme) gaue only one kind to the people of Hieruſalem. What then? the word of God is playne and manifeſt, eate and drinke. This is to be heard of vs, and preferred before all Iames's, and words of the Church.* So cleere and confeſſed then it is, that Iames the Apoſtle, and the Church of Hieruſalem in his tyme adminiſtred the Communion vnder one kind, that no other Anſwere is left to this Proteſtant, then only to make the Scriptures and the Apoſtles practiſe, one contrary to the other: then which, what more impious and abſurd?

SECT. VI.

That Proteſtant writers do beliewe, and teach the lawfull vſe of Adminiſtring the Euchariſt vnder one kind to the Laity.

IOhn Caluin in his Commentary vpon the Actes, interpreteth the for-alledged place thus, *Although* (ſayth he) *breaking of bread did ſometymes ſignify a domeſticall banquet amongſt the Hebrewes, yet in this place I do interpret it of the holy Supper, moued thereto by two reaſons: for whereas it is eaſily gathered by the ſequele that no ſmall multitude of men was there gathered togeather, it is not probable that a Supper could be prepared in a priuate houſe. Agayne, Luke afterwards declareth, that Paul, not at tyme of Supper, but after midnight, Laſt of all to haue taken Bread, to which may be added, that he doth not ſay, that he tooke meate for refection ſake, but only that he might taſt.*

Iohn Huſſe was ſo far from iudging the receiuing vnder

der both kinds, to be absolutely necessary, or a Diuine precept, as that he writeth to a friend of his in this manner: (1) *Concerning the Sacrament of the Chalice, you haue written what I wrot at Constance; If it may be endeauour, that at least it may be permitted by a Bull to them, who shall of deuotion desire it, Circumstances annexed.* Iohn Perzibrane a Bohemian Prot. after endeauour to proue Communion vnder both kinds, yet concludeth saying, (2) *Here fearing God, and taking heed of the euill Customes of others, I do confesse that I do not intend to condemne or censure for heretickes any such persons of the Church, as do impugne the Communion of the faithfull vnder both kinds;* which yet of necessity he must, if he had thought that Christ had commanded it.

(1) Ep. 48.

(2) In profess. fidei Cath. c. 29.

Luther affirmeth that, (3) *Although truly it were an excellent thing to vse both kindes in the Eucharist, and Christ in this thing hath Commanded nothing as necessary; yet it were better to follow peace and vnity which Christ hath Commanded vs to follow, then to contend about the kindes.* And againe, (4) *They sinne not against Christ who vse one kind, seeing Christ hath not commanded to vse it, but hath left it to the will of euery one, saying, As often as you shall do these, you shall do them in memory of me.* He teacheth further, that it is only a matter of indifferency. (5) *I am no author* (saith he) *that the Bohemians be compelled to the one part of the Sacrament, but that they be left to that manner which they will themselues: Let the Bishop only take care, that discord vse not by the manner of receiuing, but let him instruct them familiarly: that neither is ioyned with errour, euen as it is free from errour, that Priestes vse a different habit from the Laity.* And elswhere. (6) *If thou shalt come to a place in which one only kind is ministred, take only one, as they there receiue; if two be offered, take two, neither bring in any thing singular, or oppose thy selfe to the multitude.* And further, (7) *Further I haue not said or counsailed, neither is it my intention, that one or more Bishops by their proper Authority, may beginne to minister to any both kinds, vnles it should be so ordayned, or Commanded by some Generall Councell.* Hospinian alleadgeth Luther saying, (8) *It is not needfull to giue both kinds, but the one alone sufficeth: the Church hath power of ordayning only one, and the people ought to be content therwith, if it be ordayned by the Church.* Luther here teacheth as much in this behalfe, as any Catholick can require.

(3) Ep. ad Bohem. & in Declar. Euch. & in Ser. de Euch.

(4) De Capt. Babyl. c. de Euch.

(5) L. ad Christianam Nobil.

(6) Tom. 2. Germ. f. 100. & in alia Edit tom. 7. fol. 360. l. de vtraque specie Sacram.

(7) In Declar. in ser. de Euch.

(8) Hist. Sacram part. 2. fol. 12.

Hospi-

Hoſpinian further reporteth, that certayne (9) *Prot. answered that, they believed and confeſſed whole Chriſt to be really preſent, exhibited and receyued vnder eyther kind, and therefore vnder the only forme of Bread, neither did they iudge thoſe to do euill who communicated vnder one kind.* And both (10) Brentius and Chemnitius do lykewiſe teach, that whole and entire Chriſt is receiued vnder eyther kind. And the ſame of neceſſity muſt all they teach, who believe the vbiquity of Chriſts humanity: for if Chriſt be whole euery where, then is he whole vnder the forme of Bread, and whole in the Chalice.

(9) lib. fol. 122.

(10) In Cen. ſyn. Wittemb. art. de Euch. Chemnit. in fin. Diſp. De vtraque ſpecie.

Melanchon thinketh it a matter of indifferency, and would haue the vſe free, which ſuppoſeth no Precept of Chriſt for both: he writeth thus, (11) *Concerning both kinds of the Lords Supper, we ſee many tumults to haue beene renewed &c. but the Pope without any hurt might eaſily help theſe inconueniences, if taking away the probibition, he would leaue the vſe free. And this liberty &c. would nothing hurt any, and the whole buſines is in the Popes hands.* Agayne he compareth the indifferency heereof, with our liberty of eating, or abſtayning from ſwines fleſh, (12) *He erreth (ſayth he) that thinketh it impious to eate ſwynes fleſh; as alſo he erreth who thinketh it impious to abſtayne from ſwines fleſh; theſe things are indifferent and placed in our power, and ſo I iudge of the Euchariſt, that they ſinne not, who knowing and beleiuing this Doctrine, do vſe eyther part of this ſigne.* And whereas M. Harding alledgeth this laſt ſayng of Melanchon, as alſo Bucer, adviſing and wiſhing that *the holy Church would giue free power of receyuing this Sacrament vnder one or both kinds &c.* M. (13) Iewel cannot deny theſe teſtimonies ſo alledged by M. Harding, but acknowledgeth them for truly alledged: & further he confeſſeth that Melanchon and Bucer accompted it indifferent.

(11) Centur. Ep. Theol. ep. 74. p. 251. 252.

(12) In 2. Edit loc. com. impreſſ. Argent. Anno 1535 fol. 78.

(13) Reply p. 108. 109. 110.

Amongſt the Articles of the Conference at Ratisbone, which Bucer allowed, one was that, *for decyding of the Controuerſy of one or both kinds, it would chiefly anayle if the holy Church would giue free choyce of receyuing this Sacrament, vnder one, or both kinds:* which referring the matter to the Church, doth euidently ſuppoſe that Chriſt our Sauiour had giuen no abſolute Command thereof. And the like Confeſſion might be

ſhewed from others of their Brethren; but from hence will I inferre two things. Firſt, that Communion vnder one or both kinds, being a thing confeſſedly of it ſelfe indifferent, that then the vſe thereof vnder one, or both, cannot poſſibly be cenſured of Sacriledge, in reguard of Chriſts Inſtitution, or of any hurt or preiudice to the faythfull receyuers. The ſecond, that then alſo, was it lawfull for the Church of God vpon iuſt occaſions, abſolutly to determine or limit the vſe thereof.

SECT. VII.

Obiections from Scripture againſt Communion of the Euchariſt vnder one kind by the Laity, anſwered.

THe chiefe cauſe of the difficulty in this queſtion, & that which giueth our Aduerſaries the beſt colour for impugning the truth, and perſiſting in their errour, is, as they pretend, certaine texts of Sacred Scripture: wherfore I will endeauour by ſundry forcible reaſons to lay open the true ſenſe, ſcope, and vnderſtanding thereof, and therby to diſcouer the inſufficiency & weakenes of all ſuch their grounds as they mainly inſiſt on. Firſt then, are vrged thoſe wordes of Chriſt, (1) *Vnles you eate the fleſh of the Sonne of man, & drinke his bloud, you ſhall not haue lyfe in you.* And (2) *taking the Chalice, he gaue thankes, and gaue to them ſaying, drinke you all of this.* (3) *I receyued of our Lord, that which alſo I haue deliuered vnto you, that our Lord Ieſus &c. tooke Bread, and giuing thankes, brake and ſayd, take yee and eate, this is my Body which ſhalbe deliuered for you; this do yee for the Commemoration of me. In like manner alſo the Chalice, after he had ſupped ſaying, This Chalice is the new Teſtament in my bloud, this do yee, as often as you ſhall drinke, for the Commemoration of me:* from theſe texts Prot. inferre three things: firſt, that we are not commanded only to eate, but likewiſe, and that expreſſely, to drinke. Secondly, that this commaund of drinking, is not giuen only to Prieſts, but extended to all, it being plainly ſayd, *Drinke yee all of this.* And thirdly that the

(1) Io. 6. 53.
(2) Mat. 26. 27.
(3) 1. Cor. 11. 23. 24. 25.

the Inſtitution by Chriſt was vnder both kinds, which we are bound not to alter, but ſtraitly to imitate. Anſw. Touching thoſe wordes of Chriſt, (4) *vnles yee eate the flesh of the Sonne of man, and drinke his bloud, you shall not haue lyfe in you*: I affirme, that ſeeing, according to the Doctrine of ſundry (5) Proteſtants, nothing in the ſayd ſixt Chapter of S. Iohn, concerneth the Sacrament of the Euchariſt, but all there ſaid of eating and drinking is only to be vnderſtood of belieuing in Chriſt, that therefore according to them nothing can be produced from thence, for Communion vnder one or both kinds, ſeeing nothing therein concerneth the ſame: Yet according to the true Doctrine and Generall opinion of Catholikes teaching, the ſayd wordes, and ſundry other of the ſayd ſixt Chapter, truly, and properly to concerne only the Euchariſt; I anſwere ſecondly, that the words of S. Iohn obiected, do not neceſſarily import or containe a Precept: concerning which we are to note, that not alwayes in the doctrine of Chriſt, that byndeth of neceſſity and vnder ſin, which ſeemeth to haue the marke or badge of a Precept, but in ſundry caſes, for the attaining of the true ſenſe and vnderſtanding, we are to make recourſe to the intention of the ſpeaker. So our Sauiour himſelfe hauing cured two blind men (6) *he threatned them, See that no man know it: but they went forth and bruted him in all that Country*, and yet none houldeth that eyther heereby they ſinned, or that Chriſt intended any ſuch bond. The Bill of diuorce which Moyſes permitted, Chriſt expreſſely calleth a Command, and (7) *Precept*; he lykewiſe tould his Apoſtles that they ought to (8) *waſh one anothers feete*, and yet neyther by them, nor by vs ſince was it houlden for a matter of neceſſity: and ſundry other ſuch lyke.

(4) Io.6.53.
(5) Luth. de Capt. Babyl. c.2. Zwingl. de vera & falſa Relig. c.de Euch. Chem.2.part. Exam.p.857. & 6.1.Seſſ. 22.Conc.Trid. Calu.Inſtit. l.4.c.17. §.33. Pet.Mart. l. Cent. Gardiner.part.2.ad ſolutionem. 32.Obiect.
(6) Mat.9. 30.31.
(7) Mar.10. 4.5.
(8) Iohn.13. 14.

But ſuppoſing for the preſent, that it includeth a Precept, yet the Precept therein implyed, is not in the manner of receiuing, but in the thing receyued, for therein was cotayned one of the principall meanes or remedies for preſeruation of our ſpirituall life obtained by Baptiſme: which meanes and remedy conſiſt not in the formes of receiuing, or manner of eating and drinking, but in receiuing of the

Body and Bloud of Christ, which in either kind we do (as is formerly proued) no lesse then in both; and so accordingly our Sauiour declared himselfe saying, (9) *He that eateth me, the same also shall liue by me:* which also further may be illustrated by heedfull consideration of the circumstances following. As 1. the occasion of the words obiected, which was the incredulity of the Capharnaits, whose doubt was not whether the Sacrament was to be receiued vnder one or both kinds, but as Protestants still doubt, *whether he could giue vs his flesh to eate.* The second, is the manner of his speach, which was not by making mention of either forme or kind in the said words, but only of the things themselues, all which are contayned in either kind: yea in other places of the said Chapter, where he maketh mention of eyther kind, it is only of the bread, and none at all of the wyne; and whereas sometymes he maketh mention both of eating and drinking, yet much more often doth he mention eating. The last thing to be considered is the cõclusion of his speach which was that (10) *He that eateth this bread, shall liue for euer:* from all which it followeth that, the Iewes not doubting of the manner of receiuing vnder one or more kinds, but of the possibility of the things to be receyued, and Christ our Sauiour thereupon affeuering, not only the possibility, but also the necessity thereof to our spirituall lyfe, did therefore intend no other thinge, but the instruction of the Iewes, & declaration of the need and profit thereof: all which is performed, no lesse by receiuing one, then both kinds of the Sacrament.

(9) Io. 6. 57.

(10) Io. 6. 58.

It is also vsuall in sacred Scriptures for the Coniunction copulatiue (*&*, and) to be taken for a disiunctiue; So it is sayd, (11) *He that shall strike his father and mother shall dye*; Also, (12) *Gould and siluer I haue not*, and sundry other such like; wherein it is manifest, the sense is disiunctiue, to wit, *he that shall strike his Father, or Mother shall dy*; and *Gould, or siluer I haue not.* And as Saint Paul speaking of this very Sacrament, sayd (13) *He that eateth and drinketh vnworthily, eateth and drinketh Iudgement to himselfe*; so also he sayd, (14) *whosoeuer shall eate this Bread, or drinke the Chalice of our Lord vnworthily &c.*

(11) Exod. 22. 15.

(12) Act. 3. 6.

(13) 1. Cor. 11. 29.

(14) Ib. ver. 29.

And

And we are alſo further to obſerue, that the particle (*niſi, vnles*) including in it a negation, as, vnles, you ſhall eate, is all one to ſay, as if, you ſhall not eate, that the ſaid Negation put in the beginning of a propoſition copulatiue, doth deny both parts: and according to the Hebrew phraſe (which not only the Latin Interpreters do imitate, but euen S. Iohn who wrote in Greeke, is noted by his Expoſitors often to follow) is vnderſtood twice, to wit, as repeated in both partes; ſo according to the Hebrew it is ſaid, (15) *The wicked ſhall not ryſe in Iudgment, and the ſinners in the Councell of the Iuſt*, which yet by the Latin Interpreters is truly and properly tranſlated, (16) *The wicked ſhall not ryſe in Iudgment, nor ſinners in the Councell of the iuſt*; as alſo, (17) *Gould and ſiluer I haue not*, that is, *neither Gould, nor ſiluer I haue*. So in the preſent, *Vnles you eate the fleſh of the Sonne of Man, and drinke his Bloud, you ſhall not haue lyfe in you*; is all one with, *If you ſhall not eate the fleſh of the Sonne of Man, or, if you ſhall not drinke his Bloud, you ſhall not haue lyfe in you:* according to which ſenſe, he is only excluded from lyfe, who ſhall neither eate his fleſh, not drinke his Bloud: and from this negatiue copulatiue propoſition, doth directly follow this affirmatiue diſiunctiue, *he that ſhall eate the fleſh, or drinke the Bloud, ſhall haue lyfe*: and that this is the true ſenſe of the wordes, it is manifeſt by theſe textes precedent: *I am the liuing Bread that came downe from heauen, if any ſhall eate of this bread he ſhall liue for euer*: and theſe ſubſequent, *He that eateth me, the ſame alſo ſhall liue by me: He that eateth this Bread ſhall liue for euer*: By all which places it is euident, that the receiuing vnder the forme of Bread is ſufficient to life. Beſides it is plaine to the Reader, that in this whole Chapter, Chriſt taketh for the ſame *bread, his fleſh, his fleſh and bloud, and himſelfe*, and promiſeth to euery one of them the ſame reward, to wit, *lyfe euerlaſting*, and ſo to eate bread, to eate fleſh, and drinke bloud, is nothing els but to eate Chriſt, ſeeing whether he be receyued vnder one or both kinds, nothing giueth life but Chriſt. And ſo I may laſtly inferre, that the ſaid ſayings were plainly falſe, if the forſaid wordes, *Vnles you ſhall eate &c.* were to be taken copulatiuely, not diſiunctiuely, or which is all one, if Chriſt had

(15) *Pſ.* 1. 5.
(16) *Ib.*
(17) *Act.* 3. 6.

giuen therby a Command of both kinds. And thus we ſee, this firſt Obiection according to the doctrine of Proteſtants altogeather impertinent, and according to the truth for ſundry reaſons moſt inſufficient.

Concerning the ſecond, taken from theſe words of Chriſt, (18) *Drinke ye all of this*; from whence (19) Prot. would likewiſe inferre an vniuerſall Commād, not only of eating, but likewiſe of drinking: I anſwere, the word (*all*) is not alwayes taken in Scripture moſt vniuerſally for all men, or all things, but often for all of ſome certaine kind, otherwiſe that of S. Paul, (20) *All ſeeke the things which are their owne*, ſhould include the moſt iuſt; and that, (21) *All haue ſinned*, ſhould comprehend Chriſt; and that, (22) *All cryed Crucify him*, and the like, ſhould belong to the Apoſtles, which yet are moſt vntrue: and ſo if in the words obiected, the word (*all*) ſhould be taken vniuerſally for all, then the Sacrament were to be giuen to Turkes, Iewes, Heathens, Infants, and ſuch as cannot drinke wyne, theſe being men; all which Proteſtants exclude: wherfore the word (*all*) being to be reſtrayned, it is cleere it concerneth here the twelue Apoſtles, who as then only ſate with Chriſt at the Table, for ſo ſayth S. Marke, (23) *And when euening was come, he cometh with the twelue, and when they were ſitting at the table, and eating &c.* And further S. Marke ſayth of the Apoſtles, (24) *that they dranke all of it.* And this ſenſe alſo do all circumſtances of the place conuince, as (25) *When it was euening, he ſate downe with the twelue Apoſtles &c. And whileſt they were at Supper, Ieſus tooke Bread, and bleſſed, and brake, and gaue to his Diſciples and ſaid, Take ye and eate &c. And taking the Chalice, he gaue thankes, and gaue to them ſaying, Drinke ye all of this &c. And an Hymne being ſaid, they went forth vnto Mount Oliuet, then Ieſus ſaid vnto them, All you ſhalbe ſcandalized in me in this night.* All which places iointly conſpire in prouing the word (*all*) to cōcerne here only all the twelue Apoſtles. Now from the Example, or fact of the Apoſtles drinking or receiuing vnder both kinds, to inferre a neceſſity for the Laity to do the like, no Argument will be of force, as ſhall be hereafter cleerly conuinced.

But though this Explication be moſt literall and agreable

(18) *Mat.* 26. 27.
(19) Rogers Def. of the Art. art. 30. p. 180.
(20) *Phil.* 2. 21.
(21) *Rom.* 3. 23.
(22) *Mat.* 27. 22.
(23) *Mar.* 14. 17. 18.
(24) *Mar.* 14. 23.
(25) *Mat.* 26. 30.

greable with the Scriptures, yet Prot. obiect ſundry things againſt it, as firſt, that Chriſt forſeeing, that ſome would deny the vſe of the Chalice to all, did therfore ſay, *Drinke ye all of this*; wheras he ſaid not of the other kind, *Eate ye all of this*. But the anſwere is eaſy, for though not by the writtē word, yet by Apoſtolicall Tradition, the Church placeth in the Canon of the Maſſe theſe words, *Eate you all of this*. And ſo S. Ambroſe ſetting downe the Inſtitution of this Sacrament, (16) bringeth in our Sauiour ſaying to his Apoſtles, *Take yet, and eate yee all of this*. And though it were certaine that Chriſt had not ſayd ſo, yet it auayleth nothing, the diſparity being manifeſt, for Chriſt giuing one and the ſame Chalice, that all of them might drinke thereof, he might well ſay, *drinke yee all of this*, that ſo the firſt might know he was not to drinke all, but was to leaue ſo much as might ſuffice for all the reſt; which forme of ſpeach he vſed moſt plainly a little before in the Supper of the Paſche: for as S. Luke ſayth, (17) *Taking the Chalice he gaue thankes, and ſayd, take and deuide among you*: whereas breaking the bread himſelfe, and giuing to euery one his part, not the whole to be deuided among them, there was no ſuch neceſſity of the ſaid words.

(16) *L. 4. de Sacram. c. 5. See the like in Paſchas. de corpore Chriſti c. 15.*

(17) *C. 22. 17.*

But Luther further argueth, that to whome it is ſayd, *eate*, to them it is ſayd, *drinke*; wherefore the whole Sacrament is eyther to be giuen only to Prieſts, or alſo to the Laity; if alſo to theſe, then to all it is ſayd, *eate and drinke*; if only to Prieſts, then it is not lawfull differently from the Inſtitution of Chriſt to giue any part thereof to the Laity, and of this Argument he thus inſulteth, *I confeſſe my ſelfe to be ouercome with this vnanſwerable reaſon, neyther haue I read, heard, or found what to ſay againſt it*. But that you may ſee the weaknes of Luther ſo eaſily ouercome, and how ſmall and ſuperficiall his reading, hearing, and fynding hath beene; I anſwere: Admitting, that to the ſame was ſayd, *eate*, to whome *drinke*, viz. to the Apoſtles; as alſo I graunt that the whole Sacrament is to be giuen not only to Prieſts, but alſo to the Laity; but that which is inferred heereof is moſt falſe, to wit, that if the whole Sacrament be to be giuen to the

the Laity, then they are to *drinke:* for I already haue demonſtrated, that the whole Sacrament is truly and eſſentially vnder eyther kind. Neyther did it further follow, that if the whole Sacrament vnder both kinds was giuen only to Prieſts by Chriſt, and not to the Laity, that then it may not now be giuen to them vnder one, for though Chriſt himſelfe did not giue it, yet did he no where prohibite it, yea elswhere he commãded it, when he ſaid, (18) *Do this;* which words immediatly follow the Conſecration of the bread, & no where repeated by any of the Euangeliſts after Conſecration of the Chalice; and though S. Paul ſayth, (19) *This do you as often as you ſhall drinke &c.* yet theſe wordes are not abſolute, but with this reſtraint, viz. *As often as you ſhall drinke,* therby ſignifying not the neceſſity of drinking, but the manner and end therof, viz. in Commemoration of Chriſt; ſo eaſily might Luther haue found what to haue ſaid againſt his ſo vnanſwerable a reaſon.

(18) *Luc.* 22. 19.

(19) 1. *Cor.* 11. 25.

But yet not ſatisfyed, he further replyeth, that ſeeing Chriſt ſaid, *This is my Bloud which ſhalbe ſhed for you, and for many,* that therfore it is to be giuen to all for whom it was ſhed, in which number no doubt the Laity is contayned, & of this reaſon he thus triumpheth, *This of all chiefly vrgeth, and altogether concludeth me:* and ſo it may indeed for a ſingular aſſe; for if the Bloud were to be giuen to all for whom it was ſhed, then were it to be giuen to Iewes, Turkes, Heathens, Infants, and moſt abhominable ſinners, for all whom no doubt Chriſt ſpent his moſt precious Bloud; Wherfore the words obiected only conclude, (and that moſt manifeſtly againſt Prot.) that in the Chalice was truly Bloud, ſeeing Chriſt ſaid therof, *This is my bloud which ſhalbe ſhed for you, and for many.*

Laſtly ſome reply, that though it be true, that Chriſt ſpake vnto his Apoſtles when he ſaid, *Drinke yee all of this,* yet the Apoſtles as then repreſenting all the faithfull, all the faithfull did therfore drinke in them, and therfore now are to do it in themſelues. But this auayleth not, for beſides, that it is only but imagined and not proued, that all the faithfull were as then repreſented in the Apoſtles, yet ſuppoſing it were

were ſo, thence might we gather that now they are not bound to the Chalice, ſeeing that Precept they haue already either fulfilled in the Apoſtles, or at the leaſt, that ſufficiently they fulfill the ſame in Prieſtes, who drinke of the Chalice, and whome the Apoſtles as then did indeed truly repreſent.

The third (30) principall Obiection is taken from the firſt Inſtitution of this Sacrament, which was by Chriſt our Sauiour vnder both, and vnder the ſaid both kinds giuen to the preſent Communicants the 12. Apoſtles; Wherfore to Communicate vnder one kind ſeemeth to alter the Inſtitution of Chriſt, and therfore is vnlawfull. The weaknes of this Obiection is preſently diſcouered, if only we obſerue the true natures of an Inſtitution, and of a Precept, which of themſelues are matters moſt diſtinct, for an Inſtitution is only a Production of a thing, wherby the nature and ſubſtance of the thing is eſtabliſhed and ordayned: and though the Inſtitution in the end be referred to the vſe of the thing, in that euery thing is for his vſe; yet the Inſtitution of it ſelf commandeth nothing concerning the vſe, wheras a Precept further preſcribeth, whether, and how of neceſſity the thing is to be vſed. Matrimony for example is a thing ordained by God, and yet therfore all are not bound to mary, neither yet being maried, are they bound to vſe the ſame at all tymes, or in all ſortes, which according to Gods Inſtitution they lawfully might. And ſo all Creatures were by God ordained to ſerue man, and yet all men are not bound therby to vſe them all. The like is in the preſent: Chriſt inſtituted the Euchariſt vnder both kinds, but thereupon it doth not follow, that therfore euery one is in ſuch ſort to receiue it, no more then becauſe Chriſt inſtituted this Sacrament after waſhing of his Diſciples feete, and after ſupper, and ſo gaue the ſame to his Diſciples not faſting, that therfore the like Circumſtances now are to be obſerued in the Adminiſtration therof: ſo exceeding carefull are our Proteſtantes of their Cup of wyne, and careles of the reſt. In them is truly verifyed that of the Propher, (31) *Erit clamor in plateis ſuper vino.* *There ſhall be crying for the wyne in the ſtreets.*

(30) Rogers Def. of the Art. art. 30. p 180.

(31) Iſa. 24. 11.

CHAP. XXIII.

The true State of the Queſtion, concerning the Sacrifice of the Maſſe.

Whether Chriſt our Saviour did inſtitute a true, proper, and externall Sacrifice of his Body and Bloud, to be offered to God in his Church, in Commemoration of his Death, and Paſſion.

SECT. I.

Catholike Doctrine.

THe richeſt treaſure which Chriſt our Saviour left vnto his Church, was the holy and dreadfull Sacrifice of the Maſſe; concerning which the Catholicke Church believeth, that (1) *Our Lord God, although he was once to offer himſelfe to God the Father vpon the Aultar of the Croſſe by death, that he might there worke eternall redemption: yet becauſe his Prieſthood was not to be extinguiſhed by death, in the laſt ſupper, which night he was to be betrayed, that he might leave a viſible Sacrifice to his beloued Spouſe the Church, whereby that bloudy one, once to be performed vpon the Croſſe, ſhould be repreſented, and the memory thereof ſhould remayne to the end of the world, and the wholſome vertue thereof ſhould be applyed for the remiſſion of thoſe ſinnes, which we daily commit; declaring*

(1) Concil. Trident. Seſſ. 22. Cap. 1.

ting himſelfe to be ordayned a Prieſt for ever according to the order of Melchiſedech, he offered to God the Father his Body and Bloud vnder the formes of Bread and wyne; and vnder the ſignes of the ſame things, he gaue it to the Apoſtles, whom then he ordained Prieſtes of the new Teſtament, that they ſhould receyue it, and by theſe wordes he commanded them, and their Succeſſours in Prieſthood, that they ſhould offer it. Do ye this in Commemoration of me &c. And, (2) *becauſe in this diuine Sacrifice, which is performed in the Maſſe, the ſelfeſame Chriſt is contayned and vnbloudily offered, who offered himſelfe once bloudily vpon the Aultar of the Croſſe; the holy Synod teacheth, this Sacrifice to be truly propitiatory &c. Wherefore according to the tradition of the Apoſtles, it is duly offered not only for the ſinnes, punishments, ſatisfactions, and other neceſſities of the faithfull that are liuing, but alſo for ſuch as are dead in Chriſt, as yet not fully purged.* And, (3) *although the Church vſed ſometimes to celebrate certaine Maſſes in honour and memory of Saintes, yet she teacheth, that Sacrifice is not offered to them, but to God alone, who hath crowned them; wherupon it is, that neither the Prieſt vſeth to ſay, Peter or Paul I offer to thee Sacrifice, but thanking God for their victories, he implores their Patronage, that they in heauen would vouchſafe to pray for vs, whoſe memory we make vpon Earth.* (4) And *ſeeing the nature of men is ſuch, that without externall helpes it cannot eaſily be elevated to the meditation of heauenly things, therfore our holy Mother the Church hath ordayned certaine rites &c. and Ceremonies, as myſticall benedictions, lights, incenſe, veſtments, and many other ſuch like, from Apoſtolicke diſcipline and tradition, wherby both the Maieſty of ſo great a Sacrifice ſhould be commended, and the minds of the faithfull by theſe viſible ſignes of Religion and pietie ſhould be ſtirred vp to the contemplation of higheſt things which lye hid in this Myſtery.*

(2) Cap. 22

(3) Cap. 3.

(4) Cap. 5.

(5) Cap. de diuina miſſa.

In the firſt Councell of Nice it is ſaid, (5) *The Lambe of God, which taketh away the ſinnes of the world, to be placed vpon that ſacred table to be ſacrificed by Prieſtes vnbloudily &c.* This Canon is mentioned, and acknowledged (6) by Oecolampadius, Caluin, Iewell, and Biſſon. In the ſecond Councell of Nice, we are taught, that (7) *Our Lord or his Apoſtles, or Fathers in no place haue called an Image (or figure) the vnbloudy Sacrifice which is offered by the Prieſt, but the very Body it ſelfe, and Bloud it ſelfe.* In the Councell Senonenſe theſe Articles were condemned,

(6) Oecol. Ep. Oecol. ad Ep. Aug. Calu. inſt. l. 4. c. 17 ſect. 16. Iewell in Apol. Buſſ. true differ. part. 4. p. 555.

(7) Act. 6.

demned, (8) *Maſſe ought to be ſaid in the vulgar tongue; It is a manifeſt Errour to apply, or offer Maſſe for ſinnes, for ſatisfactions for the dead, or for any other neceſſities of our owne, or others.*

(8) *In Annotation. poſt decreta ſidei.*

According to theſe Councels all (9) Catholickes believe, that Chriſt our Lord did at his laſt ſupper, inſtitute a true, proper, and externall Sacrifice of his Body and Bloud, to be offered to his Eternall Father in memory of his Death and Paſſion by the Miniſtery of Prieſtes: and that the ſame is propitiatory for ſinne.

(9) Bellar. de Miſſa. l. 1. c. 5. &c. Rhem. Teſt in Heb. 10. 5.

Pointes Diſputable.

Some affirme (*) that Eleuation, & vocall Oblation do belong to the Eſſence of the Sacrifice. Others, place it in the Conſecration. Others in the Conſummation. But none of theſe are defyned by the Church.

(*) See Mortons Maſſe. l. 6 c. 1. ſect. 5.

Proteſtants Vntruthes.

Melanchton would ſeeme to haue ſo good liking of the Maſſe, that he writeth thus, (10) *Our Churches are falſly accuſed that they abolish Maſſe, for Maſſe is retayned with vs, and celebrated with great reuerence:* But if he meane by Maſſe only the receiuing and miniſtring of the Sacrament, then it is vntrue to ſay, that they are accuſed for aboliſhing the Maſſe; and if he meane a true oblation or Sacrifice, then alſo it is vntrue, that they are falſly accuſed; ſeeing it is (11) confeſſed, that they haue aboliſhed the Sacrifice of the Maſſe.

(10) *In Confeſſ. Auguſt. art. de Miſſa.*
(11) *In Articulis Smalcaldicis.*

He likewiſe affirmeth, that (12) *The Ancient* (writers) *before Gregory make no mention of priuate Maſſe:* But this to be cleerly falſe, is to be ſeene in S. (13) Auſtine.

(12) *In Confeſſ. Auguſt. art. de Miſſa, & in Apol. eiuſdem Articuli.*
(13) *L. de Ciu. Dei. l. 22. c. 8.*

Chemnitius (14) auoucheth, that the ſtate of the Queſtion is, whether that repreſentation by diuers geſtures and garments, which is ſeene in the Maſſe of Catholickes, be the Sacrifice inſtituted by Chriſt: As alſo (15) that completnes of words, rites, geſtures, actions, ornamentes, garmentes, which after were added to the Inſtitution of Chriſt, to be the very ſynewes and ſubſtance of the Popiſh Maſſe. But

(14) *Exam. part. 2. p. 739. 744. 761. 766.*
(15) *Ibid. p. 777.*

no

no Catholicke euer taught this, all confeſſing that theſe are only accidentall Ornaments, and Ceremonies inſtituted by the Church.

He (16) alſo teacheth that Catholickes do ſo deuide the Grace of Iuſtification betwene the Sacrifice of the Maſſe, & the receyuing of the Euchariſt, that to the Maſſe they attribute *ex opere operato*, the remiſſion of mortall ſinnes, without any labour or daunger of the ſinner, to whom that remiſſion is made; and to the receyuing of the Euchariſt only remiſſion of veniall ſinnes, and that not without great daunger of the Receyuer, who if he come not pure, receyueth to Iudgment. And hence it is, ſaith he, Catholicks are drawne from Communion, and are enticed to buy Maſſes. But all this is forgery, for no Catholicke euer wrote, that the Maſſe did remit mortall ſinnes *ex opere operato*, without any buſines or labour of the ſinner: Neither is there any vſe in the Church to aske or beg, much leſſe to buy Maſſes for remiſſion of ſinnes. And indeeed we aſcribe more to the receiuing of the Euchariſt, which we ſay, *ex opere operato*, to conferre grace, then to the Maſſe, as it is offered for any ſinner, which we only teach to impetrate for the ſinner ſome ſpeciall help, wherby he may by litle and litle returne to himſelfe; & not without any buſines or trouble, as Chemnitius falſifyeth, but by true Contrition, Confeſſion, & Satisfaction obtaine at the length remiſſion of ſinnes.

(16) *Exam. part. 2 p. 359.*

He alſo auerreth, that (17) *Popiſh writers haue noted what words were added by Roman Biſhops to the words of Conſecration vttered by Chriſt.* But though they haue noted what hath beene added in the reſt of the Canon, yet in the words of Conſecration no man is found to haue added any thing ſince the Apoſtles: A truth auouched by Pope (18) Innocentius the 3. He further vrgeth that in our opinion, (19) *The whole Canon of the Maſſe is from Apoſtolical Tradition, & if any ſhall but ſhew himſelfe to doubt thereof, he is excommunicated.* But we only ſay, that a great part of the Canon is from Apoſtolicall Tradition; & we all know that Commemoration of diuers Saints, who liued 200. yeares after the Apoſtles, was added. He (20) *yet preſſeth, that Pope Alexander ordayned water to be mingled with*

(17) *Exam. ad 4. Seſſ. de Tradit. p. 410.*
(18) *C. cum Marthæ extrade celebrat. Miſſarum.*
(19) *Exam. ad 4. Seſſ. p. 410.*
(20) *Ibid.*

wyne in the Celebration of the Eucharist: But Pope Alexanders wordes truly related are, (21) for there ought not (as we haue receyued from our Fathers, and reason it selfe teacheth) in the Chalice of our Lord eyther wyne alone, or water alone to be offerd. He (22) also teacheth, that P. Felix ordayned Consecration of Aultars: but all know, that Pope Sylueſter ordayned that ryte. Laſtly, he writeth that, (23) Pelagius added to the Maſſe the yearely memories of the dead: but Tertullian much more anciently (24) recordeth the ſame, and (25) affirmeth it to deſcend from Apoſtolicall Tradition.

(21) Ep. 1.
(22) Ibid.
(23) Ibid.
(24) L. de Monogamia.
(25) L. de Corona militis.

If you will believe Rogers, (26) The Papiſts giue out, how ſacrificing Prieſtes are the Creators of Chriſt: wheras all Papiſtes hould that Chriſt is preſent in the Sacrament not by Creation, but by Tranſubſtantiation. Againe, (27) The Papiſts deliuer how the Maſſe is a Sacrifice &c. meritorious to all them for whom it is offered, although they be not &c. endewed eyther with zeale or knowledge, but quite deſtitute of fayth, and that, ex opere operato: But all Catholickes do neceſſarily require fayth as the foundation to Grace, Merit, and Saluation. So true a Miniſter is falſe M. Rogers. But it is ordinary with Proteſtants to ſupply by lyes, what they cannot do by any Arguments of force.

(26) Def. of the Art. art. 1 p. 5.
(27) Ib. Art. 31. p. 183. 184.

Proteſtant Doctrine.

The Engliſh Proteſtant Church Decreeth, that (28) The offering of Chriſt once made, is that perfect Redemption Propitiation, and Satisfaction for all the ſinnes of the whole world, both originall and actuall, and there is none other ſatisfaction for ſinne but that alone: wherefore the Sacrifices of Maſſes, in the which it was commonly ſayd, that the Prieſt did offer Chriſt for the quicke and the dead, to haue remiſſion of payne or guilt, were blaſphemous fables and dangerous deceypts. Whitaker teacheth that, (29) Now there remaineth no ſacrifice in the Church. Caluin (30) The Lord hath ordayned no Sacrifices wherwith the holy Miniſters ſhould be buſied. Surely this Caluins Lord foreſaw that theſe holy Miniſters would be ſo buſied with their wyues and Children, that they could not well attend to pure Sacrifices.

(28) Article 31.
(29) Controu. 4. q. 1. c. 2. p. 522.
(30) In 2. Cor. 9. 19.

Prote-

Protestants agree with Ancient Heretickes.

The Manichees were condemned by S. (31) Austine for denying *externall Sacrifice*: of whome he further sayth, (32) *The Manichees being ignorant what is to be condemned in the Sacrifices of the Gentiles, and what to be vnderstood in the Sacrifices of the Hebrewes, and what to be holden, or obserued in the Sacrifice of Christians, do sacrifice their owne vanity to the Diuell.* The like impugning of Masse was condemed in the (33) Bogomilians, and (34) Pseudo-apostles. But it proceeded originally from the Father of all Heretickes, the Diuell: for so accordingly (35) Luther confessed, that he was dissuaded by Sathan from saying of Masse. The truth of this is proued at large by M. Breerly in his Lyturgy of the Masse, p. 369.

S. Cyprian vrged against the Heretickes Aquarij, that (36) *In the Chalice of our Lord water alone cannot be offered, neyther wyne alone &c.* And for the same errour were the Armenians condemned by the 6. Councell of (37) Constantinople.

The Donatistes despised *Aultars*, for which Optatus thus writeth against them, (38) *What is so sacrilegious as to breake, raze, and remoue the Aultars of God? &c. For what is the Aultar, but the seat of the Body and Blond of Christ? These all, your fury hath razed, or broken, or remoued &c. what hath Christ offended you, whose Body and Blond there resydeth? &c.* Yet all these ould heresyes are receiued by new Protestants.

(31) Tom 6. cont. Aduers. leg. & Proph. c. 19.
(32) Tom 6. cont Faust. Manich. l. 20. c. 18.
(33) Euthymius Panoplie part. 2. Tit 23. c 17.
(34) Petrus Cluniacensis Ep. 1. cont. Petrobrusianos.
(35) Lib. de Missa priuata, & Vnctione Sacerd. in Tom. 7. operum. fol. 118. Edit. Wittemb. 1558.
(36) L. 2. Ep. 3.
(37) Can. 32.
(38) L. 6. cont. Donatist.

SECT. II.

It is proued by Scriptures, that our Sauiour instituted a True, Proper, and Externall Sacrifice of his Body and Bloud, to be offered in his Church to God, in Commemoration of his Death, and Passion.

S. Austine (1) affirmeth, *That in the diuine Scripture seuerall Sacrifices are mentioned, some before the manifestation of the New Testament &c. & another now, which is agreable to this manifestation &c. and which is demonstrated not only from the Euangelicall, but*

(1) Ep. 49 q. 3.

but also from the Prophetical writings. A truth so certaine, that our now Sacrifice of the new Testament is cleerly proued by the Scriptures of both, as first from the Sacrifice of Melchisedech, of whome, and whose Sacrifice it is said, (2) *But Melchisedech king of Salem bringing forth bread and wyne, for he was the Priest of God most high, blessed him &c.* And to make the figure agree to the thing figured, and the truth to answere the figure of Christ, it is said, (3) *Our Lord hath said, and it shall not repent him, Thou art a Priest for euer according to the order of Melchisedech*; from these places wilbe easily proued that Melchisedech was a Priest, that he offered in Sacrifice bread and wyne, and that therin he did prefigure Christ our Sauiour, and his Sacrifice daily offered in the Church vnder the formes of Bread and wyne.

(2) Gen. 14. 18. 19.

(3) Ps 109. 4. Heb. 6. 20. & 7. 15. 17. 21.

I thinke no Prot. will deny, but that Melchisedech was a Priest, the Scripture calling him, *The Priest of God most high:* as also they will acknowledge, that Christ was a Priest, according to the order of Melchisedech; the same Scriptures saying most plainly of Christ, *Thou art a Priest according to the Order of Melchisedech:* The maine difficulty therfore is, whether Melchisedech did offer in Sacrifice bread and wyne, and therin he, and his Sacrifice were true figures of Christ his Priesthood and Sacrifice; and therfore the title was giuen him in respect of the Churches daily Celebration of the Sacrifice of his Body, and Bloud, vnder the same formes of Bread and wine, which Melchisedech vsed in his Sacrifice. So that in briefe, from this discourse a twofold Argument may be drawne: first that Christ being a Priest, not according to the Order of Aaron, who offered bloudy Sacrifices, but according to the Order of Melchisedech, who offered bread and wyne, that therfore he was to institute an vnbloudy Sacrifice, and that vnder the formes of Bread and wyne. Melchisedech also in that Ceremony of bread and wyne, was a type and figure of Christ, instituting the Eucharist in bread and wine; and further being a Priest of the high God, he also truly sacrificed, therfore Christ exactly fulfilling this figure did the like.

Secondly Christes Priesthood endureth to the end of the

the world, therefore his Sacrifice muſt continue as long, for he cannot be ſayd to be a Prieſt, who hath not a ſacrifice to offer: but the Sacrifice of the Croſſe was finiſhed at once, neither can it be reiterated, ſeeing Chriſt can dye no more, therefore ſome other Sacrifice muſt be, which dayly may be offered, but none ſuch is, if the Sacrifice of the Maſſe be not admitted: therefore the holy Sacrifice of the Maſſe muſt needs follow.

Proteſtants (4) in anſwere heereto, admitting Melchiſedech to haue beene a Prieſt, and to haue beene a type or figure of Chriſt, they firſt deny, that he offered bread and wyne in Sacrifice to God, but only brought forth the ſame to refreſh Abraham and his fellowes, being weary returned from battaile. Secondly they affirme the Eternity of Chriſts Prieſthood, not to conſiſt in the daily offering of Sacrifice by the Miniſtery of Prieſts, but eyther in regard that he liueth for euer, or that the vertue of his one Oblation vpon the Croſſe, continueth for euer. (4) *Calu. & Chemnit.*

But none of this will ſatisfy, being all of it barely affirmed without eyther proofe or reaſon, for though the ſayd bread and wine was giuen to Abraham and his fellowes, yet were they firſt conſecrated and offered vnto God, and then giuen vnto them, that they might partake of the Sacrifice. So that the bread and wyne principally and primarily were brought forth by Melchiſedech for Sacrifice vnto God, and ſecondarily and accidentally they were beſtowed vpon Abraham and his ſouldiars for their refection; and this to be moſt true, may be confirmed by theſe reaſons following.

Firſt, for that there was no cauſe why Melchiſedech ſhould bring to Abraham corporall food, ſeeing it is there recorded, that he returned conquerour from the warre, and with a great prey, in which were ſuch things a belonged to meate and drinke; yea his (5) ſouldiars had eaten and refreſhed themſelues before they met with Melchiſedech. Secondly, for that in ſundry places of Scripture Melchiſedech is both called a Prieſt, and his Prieſthood is deſcribed as diſtinct from that of Aaron, and moſt lyke to that of Chriſt: now to Prieſt-hood belongeth Sacrifice, it was therefore (5) *Gen. 14. 14.*

neceſſary, that this Sacrifice ſhould be ſomewhere ſet downe, ſince to ſacrifice Prieſthood is ſo ordained, that the Sacrifice being vnknowne, the Prieſthood is likewiſe vnknowne. Now there is no where els in Scripture mention made of Melchiſedechs Sacrifice, but only in this place: herfore it is certaine that the Sacrifice which he offered, was of Bread and wine. Thirdly, for that in the Hebrew, the word *protulit*, is a word properly pertayning to Sacrifice, as you ſhall read elswhere, (6) where the ſame word is vſed in Sacrifice, intimating vnto vs, that as I ſaid before, the bread & wyne were firſt offered in Sacrifice to God, and then giuen to the people to be eaten, though they wanted not other ſufficient corporall foode.

(6) Iudicum 6. 18. 19.

Laſtly, the ſame is proued from the wordes immediatly following, vpon which in Connexion dependeth the ſenſe of the whole, *for he was a Prieſt of the moſt high*: which words can poſſibly beare no other ſenſe, but that he did the function of a Prieſt in the bread & wyne which he brought; otherwiſe, if the only cauſe of bringing that prouiſion, had beene to haue relieued the Campe with victuals, the reaſon would rather haue beene yielded, for he was a bountifull King, a liberall Prince, a ſpeciall friend of Abraham, as indeed he was; but none of theſe reaſons, or cauſes fitted this purpoſe ſo well, nor ſo touched, or could touch the cauſe of his bringing forth bread and wyne, as to ſignify that he was a Prieſt, whoſe office is to offer Sacrifice. And heere let vs ioyne both ſenſes, the Proteſtant and the Catholicke, with the reaſon giuen of the bringing forth of the Bread in thoſe words, *for he was a Prieſt of the moſt high God*. Melchiſedech brought forth bread and wyne to refreſh Abraham and his ſouldiars, for he was the Prieſt of the moſt high God; heere is no connexion betwixt the precedent words and the reaſon giuen, and yet this is the Proteſtant ſenſe of this place. But to ſay as we do, Melchiſedech brought forth bread and wine to offer in ſacrifice vnto God, for he was a Prieſt of the moſt high God; heere is all connexion, and the ſenſe made perfect in the reaſon, connecting the precedent the wordes with the ſubſequent.

But

But ſome reply that in the Hebrew it is not ſayd, *for he was a Prieſt*, but, *And he was a Prieſt &c.* ſo referring the ſaid words not to the bringing forth of wyne and bread, but to the bleſſing of Abraham. But neyther will this auayle any thing, for the learned in the Hebrew know, that this Coniunctiue particle (*and*) is often taken for the cauſall, and the Hebrew particle is better expreſſed in ſuch places, by *enim*, or *quia*, *for*, or *becauſe*, then by *and*; and ſo alſo it muſt be trãſlated if the ſentence be expreſſed elegantly in the Latine phraſe, which S. Hierome vſeth to do. Beſides in the Hebrew after theſe words, *and he was a Prieſt of the moſt high*, there is an accent, which ſignifyeth there the periode to be ended, which plainly conuinceth that the ſaid words are to be ioyned with the precedent, *he brought forth wyne and bread*, not with the ſubſequent, *he bleſſed:* which diſtinction is likewiſe found in the Chaldee, Greeke, and Latin textes; alſo an Engliſh Bible (7) readeth, *Melchiſedech king of Salem brought forth bread and wyne, for he was a Prieſt of the moſt high God:* which Tranſlatiõ to be good (8) Beza proueth by Theophilact, & ſundry Examples out of the Scriptures. The later Editions alſo in like places haue not all of them the Copulatiue *and*, but ſome other word as the ſenſe requireth, and ſo elswhere they (9) tranſlate. (10) *thou art but dead, becauſe of the woman which thou haſt taken: for she is a mans wyfe*, the Hebrew phraſe is, *and she is maried to a husband*; and the (11) like in many other places may be obſerued. Only I muſt deſire the reader to aduertiſe, that when Prot. thinke it maketh for their purpoſe, then they can be content to change the particle, *And*, into, *Becauſe*; as where it is ſaid, (12) *Bleſſed art thou among women and bleſſed is the fruite of thy wombe*, they tranſlate, (13) *Bleſſed art thou among women, becauſe the fruite of thy wombe is bleſſed.* And in the Margent it is ſaid, *It sheweth the cauſe why Mary was bleſſed*; therby to inſinuate, that the B. Virgin was bleſſed, not for any intrinſecall vertue or goodnes in herſelfe, but only becauſe her ſonne was bleſſed. So kind are Prot. to the Bleſſed Virgin.

(7) Printed 1552.
(8) *Annot. in Luc.* 1. 42.
(9) Engl. Bib. of 1578. in Gen. 20, 3.
(10) *Gen.* 20. 3.
(11) *Gen.* 30. 27. *Eſa.* 64. 5.
(12) *Luc.* 1. 42.
(13) Engl. Bib. of 1578.

To come now to the ſecond Euaſion: that for Chriſt to be a Prieſt for euer, is not required a perpetuall Sacrifice by

the Ministery of Priests, but that himselfe liueth for euer, & the vertue of the Sacrifice of the Crosse continueth for euer. But this auayleth nothing, for otherwise the Leuiticall Priests, and all other Priests after the resurrection, should be called Priests for euer, because they were Priests, and shall liue for euer; Neither is the perpetuity of the vertue of the Sacrifice vpon the Crosse sufficient to make Christ a Priest for euer, no more then the effect of Nões Sacrifice (14) offered after the Deluge, which was that the world should neuer be drowned agayne, make Noe a Priest for euer. And in like sort should Christes birth, passion, and death, be sayd eternall, and Christ himselfe to be euer borne, suffer, and dye, because the effects of these remaine for euer: wherefore S. Paul requireth more, saying (15) *Euery high Priest is appointed to offer guiftes and Hosts, wherefore it is necessary that he also haue some thing that he may offer*. Wherfore if Christ should not haue something euer to offer, he should not be said to be a Priest for euer. Now, the Sacrifice of the Crosse was finished at once, and cannot be iterated, seeing Christ can dye no more, therfore some other daily and perpetuall Sactifice must be admitted, and none other was euer heard of, or imagined, but the Sacrifice of Christes Body and Bloud, vnder the formes of Bread and wyne.

(14) *Gen. 8.*

(15) *Heb. 8. 3.*

Neither may it be said, that Christ is a Priest for euer, by any offering of himselfe in heauen to God the Father, by his daily representing to him his Passion for vs, for his Representation is not properly any Sacrifice, yea any lay man may daily present and offer to God the Passion of Christ, & yet is not he therfore said to be a Priest for euer.

No lesse insufficient is that which D. Fulke pretendeth, that *he* (16) *exerciseth his continuall Priesthood in presenting his Church before God, and making continuall Intercession for vs*: for neither is this Intercession any proper Sacrifice, as is cleere by the Examples of lay-people, as also of Angels and Saintes who make Intercession for the Church: Neither is this according to the Order of Melchisedech, who offered Bread and wyne; wheras Christes Priesthood for euer is according to that order.

(16) *Against Rhem. Test in Heb. 8. sect. 5. fol. 409.*

The

The ſecond proofe from Scripture for the Sacrifice of the Maſſe, may be taken from the great Correſpondence betwene the Dedication and Celebration of the Old Teſtament and the New. The Old Teſtament was eſtabliſhed by Moyſes, with a ſolemne Sacrifice and ſprinkling of Bloud, with theſe wordes, (17) *This is the Bloud of the Teſtament which God hath Commanded vnto you:* Chriſt in Confirmation of the New Teſtament ſaid, (18) *This Chalice is the New Teſtament in my Bloud:* and according to S. Matthew, (19) *This is my Bloud of the New Teſtament which shalbe shed for many.* Now the Bloud of the Old Teſtament which Moyſes ſprinkled, was the Bloud of an Hoſt already offered, and truly and properly ſacrificed. Therfore the Bloud of the New Teſtament with Chriſt, was the bloud of himſelfe truly ſacrificed, himſelfe ſaying, *This is my Bloud.*

Thirdly the Prophet Daniel ſpeaking of the tymes of Chriſtians, foretelleth, (20) *That the daily Sacrifice shalbe taken away, and the abhominable deſolation ſet vp*; which is to be performed by *Antichriſt*. Neither can this be vnderſtood of ſpirituall Sacrifices, for neuer in Scripture is any called abſolutely a Sacrifice, and eſpecially in the ſingular number, but only that which is truly and properly a Sacrifice: as alſo with the Hebrewes, (21) the daily Sacrifice was a proper Sacrifice, viz. two lambes, which were offered daily in Holocauſt, one in the morning, and another in the euening.

And wheras Chemnitius (22) anſwereth to this, that it was ſpoken literally of Antiochus, who was before Chriſtes tyme, and is not referred to Antichriſt, but by Allegory, which kind of Argument is but of ſmall force; I muſt needs reply, that the accompliſhment of this Prophecy was prefigured, rather then fulfilled by Antiochus: and ſo according to the literall ſenſe therof, the forſaid Chapter of Daniel is explained by (23) S. Iohn, and (24) S. Paul, as concerning the tyme of the New Teſtament: as alſo by our Sauiour himſelfe, by the very words of Daniel (26) which concerne the Conſummation of the world, by the Expoſition of Fathers (27) and (28) Proteſtantes.

But Chemnitius (29) further anſwereth, that though this

(17) *Heb.* 9. 20. *Exod.* 24.
(18) 1. *Cor.* 11. 25.
(19) *Mat.* 26. 28.
(20) *Mat.* 24. 15. *Dan.* 12. 11. & 12. 31.
(21) *Exod.* 29. 38. 39. *Num.* 28. 3. 4.
(22) *Exam. part.* 2. *p.* 1561 257.
(23) Apoc. 11. 14. & 12. & 13. 5. Compare theſe with Dan. 12. 7. & 7. 25.
(24) 2. Theſſ. 4. Compare this with Mat. 24. 15.
(25) *Mat.* 24. 15.
(26) *Dan.* 12. 2
(27) *Aug. de ciu. Dei. l.* 20. *c.* 8. & 23. *Hier. in Dan. c.* 11 *Chryſoſt. opere imperf. hom.* 49.
(28) Marg. Notes of the Eng. Bible in Dan. c. 12.
(29) *Exam. part.* 2 *p.* 1574

this place doth concerne the tyme of Christians, yet it is only vnderstood of spirituall Sacrifices of prayer &c. Or of the preaching of the word, and administration of Sacraments, which (thinke Prot.) shall vpon Antichristes comming, be either taken away, or greatly corrupted. I reply, concerning Prayers, that Persecution shall rather perfect them, then abolish them: and as for the Preaching of the Word and Administration of Sacramentes, Prot. themselues teach, that these shall cõtinue, (30) *during all the tyme of Antichristes raigne*: and that these are (31) *Essentiall properties of the Church*, which Church they confesse (32) *shall continue euen during Antichrists raigne*. And as for the imagined corrupting of the Word and Sacramentes, our question vpon the Prophets words is not of corrupting them, but of the Sacrifice being taken away.

Lastly Chemnitius and others betake themselues to this desperate and wicked refuge, that this taking away of the *daily Sacrifice* is not meant of *Antichrist*, but of our *Saviour* (33) *Christ, who by his Sacrifice, shall take away the Sacrifice and Ceremonies of the law*. But this Answere is dangerous, as will appeare by the Text it selfe, (34) *The continuall Sacrifice shalbe taken away, and the abhomination to desolation shalbe set vp*: or as the same Prophet sayth yet more plainly, (25) *they shall take away the continuall Sacrifice, and they shall giue abhomination into desolation*, which to apply to our Saviours Passion were great blasphemy. To such grosse and impious euasions doth obstinacy bring an Hereticke.

Fourthly, God sayd by the Prophet Malachy, (36) *I haue no will in you &c. And guift I will not receyue of your hands, for from the rising of the Sunne, euen to the going downe, my name is great among the Gentiles, and in euery place there is Sacrificing, and there is offered to my name a cleane Oblation, because my name is great among the Gentiles*. This to be spokē of the tyme of Christians is euident by all Circumstances, and Prot. do not deny it, but they (37) answere that the Prophet speaketh not peculiarly of our Priests, nor of a Sacrifice to be offered only by them, but of all Christians in generall, & their spirituall Sacrifices prayer, thankesgiuing &c. they being therefore called, (38) *A holy Priesthood to offer vp spirituall Sacrifices acceptable to God.*

But

(30) Gifford vpon Reuel. ser. 11. p. 192. Fulk. ag. Rhem. Test. in Reuel. c. 11. sect. 4. Szeged. in Tabul. Analyt. p. 368.

(31) Whitak. cont. Dur. l. 3. p. 260.

(32) Whitak. against Reyn. p. 34. Fulke. ag. Rhem. Test. in 2. Thess. 2. sect. 5.

(33) In the Engl Bible of 1576. in the Marg. notes in Dan. 12. 11. Chemnit. Exam. part. 2. p. 157.

(34) *Dan.* 12. 11.

(35) *Dan.* 11. 31.

(36) *Malach.* 1. 10. 11.

(37) Bilson in his true Difference &c. part. 4. p. 517. Fulk. ag. Heskins p. 122. Whi-

But this anſwere is many wayes defectiue. 1. In that the Prophet directed his ſpeach of reiecting the Iewiſh Sacrifices, not to the people in generall, but only to the Prieſtes, beginning his diſcourſe, (39) *O you Prieſtes that deſpiſe my name &c You offer vncleane Bread vpon my Aultar.* And thereupon then foretelleth the reiecting of their Sacrifice, and the allowance inſteed therof of the new and pure Oblation: by which oppoſition he muſt in all due proportion be thought to meane, that as in reiecting the Prieſtes of the Old Law, & their Sacrifice, he ſpake not of all the people in generall, but only of Prieſtes in ſpeciall, and their externall Sacrifices ſo reiected; ſo likewiſe in his prediction of a pure Oblation to ſucceed in place of the other, he meant an Externall worſhip or Sacrifice to be offered. A truth ſo cleere, that Craſtouius acknowledgeth the ſame, ſaying, (40) *Truly the Oppoſition of the Prieſtes doth require in this place a Sacrifice properly taken.* Yea he further acknowledgeth Malachies Prophecy (41) *to be meant of the Euchariſt.* And Caluin ſpeaking of this place of Malachy, granteth that therby, (42) *A change of externall worſhip is plainly and cleerly foretould, ſub Chriſto regnante, to be in Chriſtes tyme.* Now that this change was to be made into the Sacrifice of Chriſtes Body and Bloud, S. Auſtine plainly teacheth in theſe words, (43) *It belongeth to the participation of this Table which the Prieſt himſelfe the Mediatour of the New Teſtament offereth according to the Order of Melchiſedech of his Body & Bloud: for that Sacrifice hath ſucceeded all thoſe Sacrifices of the Old Teſtament, becauſe inſteed of all thoſe Sacrifices, his Body is offered, and giuen to the Communicantes.*

Secondly the Prophet foretelling by whom this cleane Oblation is to be offered in the tyme of the Ghoſpell (as Prot. (44) vnderſtand it) affirmeth and ſaith, (45) *He ſhall purge the ſonnes of Leui, and will ſtreine them as gold and as ſiluer, & they ſhalbe offering Sacrifices to our Lord in Iuſtice.* Now, that by the ſonnes of Leui is not vnderſtood all the people, but a peculiar ſort choſen to ſacrifice, who therefore are figuratiuely tearmed the ſonnes of Leui, becauſe by their Sacrifice and Prieſt-hood, they ſhould aboliſh the Sacrifice & Prieſthood of Leui, and ſucceed in place thereof; it is ackowledged

tak. cont. Dur. l. 9. p. 733.

(38) *Pſa 2. 5.*

(39) *Mal. 1. 7.*

(40) *L. 1. de opiſ. Miſſ. ſect. 132. p. 60.*

(41) *Ibid. ſect. 139. 144. 117.*

(42) *Calu. in Buxderfius Synagoga Iudaica. p. 555.* And ſee the ſame in Calu. Latin Epiſtle. p. 683.

(43) *De Ciu. Dei. l. 17. c. 20.*

(44) Reynolds Confer. p. 546. Engl Bible of 1470. in the contents and marg. notes of Mal. c. 3.

(45) *Mal. 3. 3.*

ledged by Prot. saying, (46) *He beginneth at the Priests, that they might be lightes and shine to others*: so cleerly distinguishing these Priests from the other People: as also by conference of this place with the Prophet Esay, who likewise vnder the same word foretelleth the Priesthood of the New Testament saying, (47) *And I will choose out of them Priests and Levites*: where Levits signify not all Christians, but only as sundry Prot. teach, (48) *Ecclesiasticall Pastors*. Thirdly, according to Prot. (49) there is not in our Prayer or other best actions any righteousnes, but impurity and sinne, wherefore by them cannot be vnderstood the pure oblation to God in Iustice. Againe, the Spirituall Sacrifice of prayer is vnderstood agreably to the Prot. Translation, by the word, *Incense*, according to the like vnderstanding thereof in other (50) places of Scripture. Wherefore the Prophet heere foretelling both *Incense, and pure Oblation*, as things different, it is therby apparant, that by pure Oblation cannot be vnderstood spirituall Sacrifices, which are comprehended vnder the word, *Incense*: which distinction S. Chrisostome obserueth, saying, (51) *See how manifestly and plainly he hath expressed the mysticall Table, which is the vnbloudy Sacrifice; the Incense also he calleth the sacred prayers which are offered after the sayd Sacrifice*. And in the same place he distinguitheth also this *vnbloudy Sacrifice* yet more expressely frō the spirituall Sacrifices of Prayer, Almes &c. in that he there numbreth vp these, and making this in expresse termes a distinct Sacrifice from the other.

(46) Marg. notes of the Engl. Bible of 1576. in Mal. 3. 3.
(47) Isa. 66.
(48) Reyn. Confer. p. 544. Hook. Eccl. Pol. l. 5. p. 236. Marg. notes of Bib. 1576. in Isa. 66. 21.
(49) *Luth. in asser. art* 32. Whitak. cont. Dur. l. 8. p. 572.
(50) *Apoc.* 8. 3. 4 Ps. 140. 2. Sap. 18. 21.
(51) *In Ps.* 95.

Againe in the Scriptures, the word Sacrifice or Oblation is not taken improperly, but when it hath some thing adioyned vnto it, as the Sacrifice of Praise, of Iustice &c. and so is sufficiently declared to be taken for a spirituall Sacrifice. Neither as some others pretend, may it be sayd to be a pure Oblation only, because God repureth it for such, for therefore the Oblation is sayd to please God, because it is cleane, not therefore to be cleane, because God so repureth it. Besids if the Oblation were not truly pure in it selfe, it would not haue beene generally sayd, *In euery place is offered vp to my name a pure Oblation*; for in many places do wicked Priests, euen among Christians, as much as lyeth in them

them pollute the Sacrifice, and vndoubtedly offer vp many vncleane and vnacceptable prayers.

Fiftly, the Sacrifice of the New Teſtament is ſtrongly proued by the very wordes of the firſt Inſtitution therof; for our Sauiour ſaid not, *This is my Body which is giuen to you*, or, *The Cup which is powred to you*, but, *pro vobis, for you*, to wit, to God in Sacrifice for you. And he ſpeaketh this in the preſent tenſe, concurring agreably with his action then preſent, which proueth, that he then did actually offer this Sacrifice. Neither auaileth it to anſwere, that the Vulgar Tranſlation hath (52) *which ſhalbe shed*, to wit, vpon the Croſſe, or that the preſent tenſe, as D. Fulke (53) vrgeth, is often vſed for the future; for the vulgar Tranſlation vſeth both (54) tenſes, the preſent in Conſecration of the Bread, and future in Conſecration of the Chalice, and this to ſignify two certaine truthes, one that as then it was giuen at the ſupper, another that it ſhould be afterwards giuen vpon the Croſſe: And though the preſent tenſe be ſometimes taken for the future, yet much more often for the preſent, and the rather here, in that the 3. Euangeliſtes, with S. Paul, do vſe the ſame: which alſo being more literall and proper, is not to be denied without moſt vrgent reaſon. Add yet hereunto that S. Paul ſayth, (55) *giuing thankes brake &c.* which word of *breaking* muſt needs be referred to the Sacrament, in regard of the outward formes, which are in tyme of ſacrificing broken, but not to the Croſſe. (56) *For when they ſaw that he was dead, they brake not his legs &c. that the Scripture might be fulfilled, You ſhall not breake a bone of him.* And according to this S. Chryſoſtome expounding theſe words of the Apoſtle, (57) *The bread which we breake &c.* ſayth therupon, (58) *Why doth the Apoſtle add, which we breake? this in the Euchariſt may be ſeene, but on the Croſſe not, but altogether the contrary. for a bone of him (ſayth the text) you ſhall not breake, therfore what he doth not ſuffer on the Croſſe that doth he (by way of myſtery, and ſignification) ſuffer in the Sacrifice of the laſt ſupper, when the formes are broken.* Yea Caluin himſelfe writing vpon the foreſaid words of S Paul, ſayth, (59) *Here I expound, to be broken to be put, for to be ſacrificed though improperly, yet not abſurdly &c. For not ſimply and without addition,* p. 323.

(52) *Luc.* 22. 20.
(53) *Againſt Rhem. Teſt. in Mat.* 26. *ſect.* 20. *p.* 54.
(54) *Luc.* 22. 19, 20.
(55) 1. *Cor.* 11. 24.
(56) *Ioan.* 19. 33. 36.
(57) 1. *Cor.* 10. 16.
(58) *In.* 1. *Cor. hom.* 24.
(59) *In.* 1. *Cor.* 11. 24.

our Lord doth offer vs his Body, but as it was ſacrificed for vs. Chemnitius alſo ſaith of the Sacrament, (60) *There is the Sacrifice dispenſed and taken, which was once offered on the Croſſe for our ſinnes.* It then Chriſt was at his laſt Supper preſent in the Sacrament by way of Sacrifice, and before his Sacrifice done vpon the Croſſe, how can it be, but that the Euchariſt, then was, and yet is a Sacrifice? But of this I haue ſpoken more largely before.

(60) Exam. part. 2. p. 153.

Sixthly, whereas it is ſayd, *Do this in remembrance of me*, the word, *doe*, doth ſignify to ſacrifice, as it is often vſed in other partes of Scripture, as (61) *Facietis & hircum pro peccato &c. you ſhall offer a goate for a Sacrifice for ſinne:* And (62) *faciet Sacerdos vnum pro peccato, & alterum in holocauſtum, The Prieſt ſhall offer one Sacrifice for ſinne, and the other for a holocauſt:* ſo alſo is this word, *doe*, vſed for ſacrifice amongſt prophane authors, as (23) *Cùm faciam vitula pro frugibus ipſe venito, when I ſacrifice heyfers for fruites come thou.* In the ſame ſenſe do Varro, Cicero, Plautus, Macrobius, vſe the word, *doe*, for Sacrifice.

(61) Leuit. 31. 19.
(62) Num 6. 11.
(63) Virgilius Eclog. 4.

The laſt proofe out of Scripture for the Sacrifice of the Maſſe, is that of S. Paul, (64) *The Chalice of Benediction which we do bleſſe, it is not the Communication of the Bloud of Chriſt? And the Bread which we breake, is it not the participation of the Body of our Lord? for being many we are one Bread, one Body, all that participate of one bread &c. they that eate the hoſts, are they not partakers of the Aultar? the things that the heathen do immolate, they do immolate to Diuells &c. you cannot be partakers of the Table of our Lord, and of the Table of Diuells. We haue an Aultar, whereof they haue not power to eate, which ſerue the Tabernacle.* Heere S. Paul compareth the Sacrifice of the Euchariſt, and the Aultars of Chriſtians, with the Sacrifices and Aultars of the Iewes and the Gentils, which compariſon were impertinent, if we had not true externall Sacrifices and Aultars, as the Iewes and Gentils had.

(64) 1. Cor. 10. 16. &c.

But heere ſome (65) Proteſtants thinke to help themſelues by falſly tranſlating the wordes thus: (66) *Know you not, that they which wayte of the Temple, are partakers of the Temple.* (67) *And are not they which eate of the Sacrifice, partakers of the Temple?* In both which places, the Apoſtles wordes

(65) Engl. Bib. of 1582.
(66) 1. Cor. 9. 13.
(67) 1. Cor. 10. 18.

wordes in Greeke is θυσιαστήριον, which ſignifyeth *Aultar*, and not *Temple*. So that if no other Anſwere will ſerue their turne, they will rather corrupt the Scriptures, then yield to the truth.

SECT. III.

That the Ancient Fathers expound the Scriptures agreably with Catholickes in Confirmation of the Sacrifice of the Maſſe.

S. Clemens Alexandrinus applyeth Melchiſedech his Sacrifice to the Sacrament of the Euchariſt thus, (1) *Melchiſedech King of Salem, Prieſt of God moſt high, gaue wyne and bread ſanctifyed nutriment in type of the Euchariſt.* (1) *L. 4. Strom. prof. fin.*

With whom agreeth S. Cyprian, ſaying, (2) *Chriſt is Prieſt for euer according to the order of Melchiſedech, which Order is this, comming from that Sacrifice, and thence deſcending, that Melchiſedech was Prieſt of God moſt high, that he offered Bread and wyne, that he bleſſed Abraham; for who is more a Prieſt of God moſt high, then our Lord Ieſus Chriſt, who offered Sacrifice to God the Father, and offered the ſame which Melchiſedech had offered, bread and wyne, viz. his owne Body and Blood.* And a litle after, *That therfore in Geneſis the bleſſing might be rightly celebrated about Abraham by Melchiſedech the Prieſt, the Image of Chriſts Sacrifice conſiſting in bread and wyne went before, which thing our Lord perfecting and performing, offered bread, and Chalice mixt with wyne, and he that is the plenitude, fulfilled the veritie of the prefigured Image.* S Cyprians ſayings are ſo cleere for Sacrifice, that Fulke ſaith, (3) *It is granted that Cyprian thought the Bread and wyne brought forth by Melchiſedech to be a figure of the Sacrament, and that herein alſo Melchiſedech reſembled the Prieſthood of Chriſt.* The Centuriſts recite this ſpeciall ſaying of Cyprian: (4) *Our Lord Ieſus Chriſt, ſayth Cyprian, l. 2. Ep. 3. is the high Prieſt of God the Father, and firſt offered Sacrifice to God the Father, and commanded the ſame to be done in remembrance of him; and that Prieſt truly executeth Chriſtes place, that doth imitate that which Chriſt did, and then he offereth in the* (2) *Ep. 63. ad Cæcilium.* (3) *Against Heskins. &c. p. 210.* (4) *L. 2. Ep. 3.*

Church a true & ful Sacrifice to God. This saying is ſo diſpleaſant to the Centuriſts, that they ſay (5) *Cyprian affirmeth ſuperſtitiouſly, that the Prieſt executeth Chriſtes place in the Supper of the Lord.*

(5) In the Alphab table of the 3. Cen vnder the leuer S Col. 83.

Euſebius Cæſarienſis writeth thus, (6) *Euen as he who was Prieſt of Nations was neuer ſeene to offer corporall Sacrifices, but only bread and wyne when he bleſſed Abraham: ſo firſt our Lord and Sauiour himſelfe, then Prieſtes that come from him, exerciſing the ſpirituall office of Prieſtood in all Nations after the Eccleſiaſticall Ordinances, do repreſent the miſteries of his Body and healthfull Bloud in bread and wyne, which Miſteries Melchiſedech knew ſo long before by diuine ſpirit, and vſed as repreſentations of things to come.*

(6) L. 5. Demonſt. Euang. c. 3.

S. Ambroſe affirmeth that, (7) *We know the figure of the Sacraments went before in Abrahams tymes when Melchiſedech offered Sacrifice.* And in the ſame booke a litle after he addeth, (8) *It is cleere that oblations of cattell are vanished, which were in Aarons Order, but Melchiſedechs Inſtitution remayneth, which is celebrated all the world ouer in Adminiſtration of the Sacraments.* S. Ambroſe his ſayings are ſo pregnant for Sacrifice, that the Centuriſts do mention them (9) with much diſlike, charging them with (10) *Tranſubſtantiation, and application* (of the Euchariſt) *for the liuing and the dead.*

(7) L. 5. de Sacram. c. 1.
(8) Ib. c. 3.
(9) Cent. 4. c. 4. Col. 294. 295.
(10) Cent. 4. c. 4. Col. 295.

Saint Hierome aduiſeth to (11) *Haue recourſe to Geneſis, and you ſhall find Melchiſedech King of Salem, Prince of this Citty, who euen there in figure of Chriſt offered Bread and wyne; & dedicated the Chriſtian Myſtery in our Sauiours Body and Bloud.* And elſwhere, (12) *Melchiſedech offered not bloudy victims, but dedicated the Sacrament of Chriſt in Bread and wyne a ſimple and pure Sacrifice.* And yet in a third place, (13) *Our Myſtery is ſignifyed in the word of Order, not by Aaron, in immolating brute victimes, but in offering bread and wyne, that is the Body and Bloud of our Lord Ieſus.* And laſt of all, (14) *Melchiſedech the Prieſt of God moſt high by offering Bread & wine prefigured the Miſtery of the Euchariſt.* With whome agreeth S. Chriſoſtome ſaying, *After that Melchiſedech King of Salem brought bread and wyne, for he was Prieſt of God moſt high, Abraham receiued his Oblations.*

(11) Ep. ad Marcell. Vt migret Bethleem.
(12) Ep. ad Euagrium.
(13) Quæſt. in Gen. c. 14.
(14) In c. 26. Matth.
(15) Ho. 36. in Gen.

Laſtly, S. Auſtine expreſſely teacheth that, (16) *Melchiſedech bringing forth the Sacrament* (or Myſtery) *of our Lords Table knew how to figure his eternall Prieſtood.* And againe in another

(16) Ep. 95.

therplace, (17) *There firſt appeared that Sacrifice, which is now offered to God by Chriſtians in the whole world.* (18) *Agayne there was formerly as you haue knowne, the Sacrifice of the Iewes according to the Order of Aaron in the Sacrifices of beaſtes, and this in Myſtery. For as yet was not the Sacrifice of the Body and Bloud of our Lord, which the faythfull know, and ſuch as haue read the Ghoſpell: which Sacrifice now is ſpread ouer the whole world. Set therefore before your eyes two Sacrifices, that according to the Order of Aaron, and this according to the Order of Melchiſedech, for it is written,* (19) *Our Lord hath ſworne, and it ſhall not repent him, Thou art a Prieſt for euer according to the Order of Melchiſedech.* And elſwhere he expreſſely teacheth that, (20) *Chriſt of his body and Bloud inſtituted a Sacrifice according to the Order of Melchiſedech.* And whereas Saint Auſtine affirmeth, (21) *The Sacrifice to be a propitiation for ſuch as being dead, are not very euill, or in ſtate of damnation,* Hutterus in ſome anger ſayth herof, (22) *It can neuer be defended.* Caluin alſo chargeth him (23) *with Sacrifice of the Maſſe.*

(17) *L. 18. de Ciu Dei. c. 22. See him alſo. l. 17. c. 17. l. 18. c. 35. & in pſ. 109. l. 1. cont. aduerſ. leg. & prophet. c. 20. Ser. 4. de Sanctis Innocentibus.*

(18) *Con. 1. in Pſ 35.*

(19) *Pſ. 109. 4.*

(20) *Conc. 2. in Pſ. 33.*

(21) *Enchyr. c. 110.*

(22) *De Sacrif. Miſſatico. p. 525.*

(23) *De vera Eccleſiæ Reform.*

Concerning that place of Malachy, it is both interpreted and applyed to the Sacrifice of the Maſſe by ſundry Fathers. Iuſtinus Martyr writeth, (24) *Concerning our Sacrifices being of the Gentiles, which are offered in all places, I meane touching the bread of the Euchariſt, and the Cup likewiſe of the Euchariſt, euen then hauing ſpoken, he fortold, that we truly did glorify his Name, but that you did prophane it &c. Doubtles God receiueth Sacrifices of none, but of his Prieſtes, therfore God preuenting, hath teſtifyed that all are gratefull vnto him who offer ſacrifices through his name, which Chriſt Ieſus commanded to be done, to wit, in the Euchariſt of the Bread and Chalice, which things in euery place are done of Chriſtians, but what things are done, and offered of thoſe your Prieſts, refuſing he caſteth them away, ſaying: And I will not receyue ſacrifices at your hands, becauſe from the ryſing of the Sunne to the going downe therof, my Name is great among the Gentils, but you haue prophaned it.*

(24) *Dial. cum Tryphone.*

S. Iræneus affirmeth of Chriſt that, (25) *Giuing counſaile alſo to his Diſciples, to offer the firſt fruites of his Creatures to God, not as it were needing it, but that they might neither be vnfruitfull nor vngrateſull, he tooke him, who is made of the Creature of bread, and gaue thankes ſaying, This is my Body, and likewiſe the Chalice he confeſſed to be his Bloud, which is made of that creature which is in vſe a-*

(25) *L. 4. aduerſ. hær. c. 32.*

mongſt vs, and taught a new Oblation of the New Teſtament, which Oblation the Church receyuing from the Apoſtles, throughout the whole world offereth to God, to him who giueth vs nourishment, the firſt fruits of his guiftes in the New Teſtament, of whom amongſt the twelue Prophets, Malachy hath thus foretould: I haue no will in you, ſayth our omnipotent Lord, and I will take no Sacrifice at your hands, becauſe from the riſing of the Sunne, to the ſetting thereof, my Name is glorifyed amongſt the Gentiles, and in euery place Incenſe is offered to my Name, and a pure Sacrifice, becauſe my Name, is great amongſt the Gentiles, ſayth our Lord Almighty, manifeſtly ſignifying by theſe thinges, becauſe the former people indeed ceaſed to offer to God, but in euery place a Sacrifice is offered to God, and this pure, for his Name is glorifyed amongſt the Gentils. The Centuriſtes ſay thereof, (26) *Irenæus &c. ſeemeth to ſpeake very incommodiouſly, when he ſayth, He taught the new Oblation of the New Teſtament, which the Church receiuing from the Apoſtles, offered to God ouer all the world.* S. Hieſome vpon this place of Malachy writeth thus, (27) *And that they may know not in Iudæa one Prouince of the world, neyther in one City of Iudæa called Hieruſalem, but in euery place an Oblation to offered, not vncleane, as was offered by the people of Iſraell but a cleane one, as in the Ceremonies of the Chriſtians; for from the riſing of the Sunne to the ſetting thereof, the name of our Lord is great amongſt the Gentils, our Sauiour ſaying, Father I haue manifeſted thy name to men.* And immediatly after he addeth, *And therefore of you, Prieſts and Princes of the Iewes, in euery place a cleane Oblation is offered vnto me, & my Name is great among the Gentils.*

(26) Cont. 2. c. 4. Col. 63.

(27) Comment. in 1. Malach.

Euſebius Cæſarienſis wryting obiter vpon this place ſayth, (28) *We ſacrifice therefore to our higheſt Lord a Sacrifice of prayſe: we ſacrifice to God a full, odoriferous, and moſt holy Sacrifice, we ſacrifice after a new manner, according to the New Teſtament, a pure hoſt.*

(28) L. 1. Demonſt. Euang. c. 10.

S. Chryſoſtome expoundeth the ſame place thus, (29) *The Church which euery where carryeth about Chriſt in it, is prohibited from no place, but in euery place there be Aultars, in euery place doctrine; theſe things God foretould by his Prophet, for both declaring the Churches ſincerity and bringing into obloquie the ingratitude of the other people, he ſpeaketh vnto them, I haue no pleaſure in you &c.*

(29) Ad pſ. 95.

marke

marke how cleerely, and plainly he interpreteth the myſticall Table, which is the vnbloudy hoſt, and the pure perfume he calleth holy prayers, which are offered after the hoſt. Thou ſeeſt how it is granted that, that Angelicall Sacrifice ſhould euery where be knowne, thou ſeeſt it circumſcribed with no limits, neyther the Aultar, nor the ſong: In euery place Incenſe is offered to my Name, therefore the myſticall Table, the heauenly and exceeding Venerable Sacrifice is indeed the prime pure hoſt.

S. Cyprian affirmeth that, (30) *The old Sacrifice is abrogated, and the new celebrated, with Malachie*; and then repeateth at large the place of the Prophet. And elſwhere (31) repeating our Sauiours wordes, *This is my flesh, This is my Bloud*, ſayth thereupon, *So often as with theſe words of this ſayth it is done, this bread ſubſtantiall, and this Cup conſecrated with holy bleſſing, profiteth to the health of the whole man, being both a medicine and Sacrifice to heale Infirmities, and purge ſinnes.*

(30) *L. 2. cont. Iudæos c. 16.*

(31) *De cœna Dom.*

S. Auſtine auoucheth, that, (32) *Malachias prophecying of the Church, which we ſee by Chriſt now propagated, ſpeaketh plainly to the Iewes in the perſon of God, (I haue no pleaſure in you &c.) This Sacrifice by the Prieſthood of Chriſt according to the Order of Melchiſedech, ſeeing we now ſee it to be offered vp in euery place, from the Sunne ryſing to the ſetting thereof, but the Sacrifice of the Iewes to whome it is ſayd, I haue no pleaſure in you &c. they cannot deny to haue ceaſed &c.* This is ſo cleere (33) in the Fathers that Caluin ſayth, *It is ordinary to thoſe knaues* (meaning Catholikes) *to ſcrape together whatſoeuer is read faulty in the Fathers: when therefore they obiect the place of Malachy to be expounded by Irenæus of the Sacrifice of the Maſſe, the Oblation of Melchiſedech to be ſo handled by Athanaſius, Ambroſe, Auguſtine, Arnobius, let it be briefly anſwered, the ſelfeſame writers elſwhere do interprete Bread, the Body of Chriſt, but ſo ridiculouſly, that reaſon and truth compelleth vs to diſſent.*

(32) *L. 18 de Ciu. Dei. c. 35.*

(33) *In Tract. Theol. Caluini. p. 389.*

Craſſouius reproueth S. Gregory Niſſen ſaying, (34) *Doth he not know that the opinion of Nyſſen is of it ſelfe abſurd &c. He ſayth, when therefore Chriſt gaue to his Diſciples his body to eate &c. then latently &c. vnſpeakably, and inuiſibly the Body was ſacrificed &c.*

(34) *De Opific. Miſſæ. l. 2. ſect. 264. p. 81.*

(35) *Eccl. Hier. c. 3.*

S. Denis (35) ſetting downe how the Biſhop cõmeth to the

the Aultar and beginneth Sacrifice, affirmeth that, *After the ſacred prayſes of Gods workes, he excuſeth himſelfe for having offered the ſaid Sacrifice, ſtill pioufly crying vnto him, Thou haſt ſaid, Do this in remembrance of me.*

The Fathers Doctrine herin is ſo manifeſt, that Caluin ſayth, (36) *When ſo many Ancient Doctours of the Church had forged without Commandement a Sacrifice in the ſupper of Chriſt, and ſo by adding Sacrifice had adulterated the ſupper, afterwards they endeauoured on euery ſyde, how to get colours wherwith to ſhadow their Error.* Againe, (37) *The Ancient Fathers are not to be excuſed, for ſo much as it appeareth, that they haue varyed from the pure and proper Inſtitution of Chriſt: for ſeeing the Supper is to be celebrated to this end, that we communicate with the Sacrifice of Chriſt, they not content herwith, haue alſo added an Oblation: this addition I affirme to be faulty.*

(36) *In Hebr. c. 7. 9.*

(37) *De vera Eccl. Reform. in Tract. Theol. p. 389. Inſt l. 4. c. 18.*

Craſtouius confeſſeth, that, (38) *The Fathers thought the Euchariſt to be a Sacrifice according to the Order of Melchiſedech.* Fulke alſo ſayth, (39) *I confeſſe, that diuers of the old Fathers were of opinion, that the Bread and wyne which Melchiſedech brought forth was ſacrificed by him, and that it was a figure of the Sacrament, which they improperly called a Sacrifice &c. Cyprian alſo thought that heerein Melchiſedech reſembled the Prieſthood of Chriſt.*

(38) *De opi. & ſcio Miſſæ. l. 2. p. 28. 58. 202. 171. Calu. in Ep. ad Heb. c. 7. 9*

(39) *Againſt Heſk p. 99.*

And that the Fathers beleeued that the Sacrifice of the Euchariſt was alſo propitiatory, or ſatisfactory for ſinne, Craſtouius acknowledgeth ſaying, (40) *But the ſayings of the Fathers do not only import impetration but alſo a certayne intrinſecall force of appeaſing: for which he alledgeth the ſayings of Origen, Athanaſius, Chryſoſtome, Ambroſe, Gregory, Bede &c.*

(40) *De opi. ficio Miſſæ. l 1 p. 167.*

The Fathers alſo conſtantly taught, that this Sacrifice was to be offered for the dead. Gifford ſayth, (41) *In the (Churches) publicke worship to pray for the Soules of the Dead, & to offer Oblation for the dead was generall in the Church long before the dayes of Auſtine, as appeareth in Cyprian and Tertullian.* Fulke acknowledgeth that, (42) *Tertullian, Cyprian, Auſtine, Hierome, and a great many more do witneſſe, that Sacrifice for the dead, is the Tradition of the Apoſtles.* And very conſequently it is graunted, that, (43) *It cannot be knowne at what tyme, and by what man, the ſupper of the Lord was caſt out of poſſeſſion by the Maſſe.* Bea-

(41) *Demonſtration againſt Browniſtes. p. 38.*

(42) *Confut of Purgat. p 302. 303. 391.*

(43) *Alcam in Apol. pro oœna Dominj. p. 31.*

con

con ſaith, (44) *The Maſſe was begotten, conceyued, and borne anone after the Apoſtles dayes, if all be true that Hiſtoriographers write.* How vniuerſall the vſe of the Maſſe was Luther ſhall tell vs ſaying, (45) *The Maſſe is beleeued euery where to be a Sacrifice which is offered to God; to theſe agree the ſayings of holy Fathers, ſo many examples, ſo great cuſtome conſtantly obſerued ouer the world, &c.* And a litle after, *Neither let it trouble you that the whole world hath a contrary Iudgment, and vſe &c.* Caluin affirmeth that, (46) *The abhomination of Maſſe hath made drunke all the kings of the Earth, and people from the chiefeſt to the loweſt.* And againe, (47) *Satan hath blinded almoſt all the whole world with a moſt peſtilent Errour, that it ſhould beliue the Maſſe to be an Oblation and Sacrifice for the obtaining forgiuenes of ſinnes &c. The Romane Antichriſt and his Prophets haue infected the whole world with that opinion.* Now if this Argument of Bilſon in behalfe of Biſhops be good, that, (48) *all the Churches of Chriſt throughout the world could not at any one tyme ioyne in one and the ſelfeſame kind of Gouernment, had it not bene deliuered and ſetled by the Apoſtles*; the ſame then for the very ſame reaſon may be ſaid of the Sacrifice of the Maſſe. And as for the very Ceremonies of the Maſſe now vſed, S. Auſtine ſpeaking of *Kyrie eleyſon*, affirmeth, that (49) *All Chriſtian Greekes, Latines, and Barbarous do pray for mercy in the Greeke tongue.* He mentioneth, (50) *Surſum corda, Habemus ad Dominum, Gratias agamus Domino Deo noſtro, Dignum & iuſtum eſt &c.* and the word *Maſſe*, ſaying, (51) *In the leſſon which is to be read to vs at Maſſe, we are to heare &c.* Craſtonius confeſſeth that, (52) *S. Auſtine and S. Ambroſe vſed the word Maſſe, and thereby vnderſtood that Sacred action of the Chriſtian Liturgy.* Fulke alſo acknowledgeth, that (53) *About S. Auſtines tyme the Name of Maſſe began to be in vſe, as it ſeemeth by Concil. Mileuit. Can. 12.*

S. Gregory (54) and S. (55) Bede make report of two ſeuerall perſons who being taken priſoners in the warres, were by their friends thought to be ſlaine: in ſo much as a Prieſt, Brother (as S. Bede reporteth) to the one of them, *cauſed Maſſe to be often ſayd for parſon of his ſoule*; And the like as S. Gregory reporteth, was procured in behalfe of the other by his *wyfe*: whereupon it happened that at, *certayne*

(44) Relicks of Rome fol. 144.

(45) *De Capt. Babyl. c. 2.*

(46) *In Hit. l. 4. c. 18 ſect.* (47) *Iord. ſect. 2.*

(48) Perpetuall Gouern. &c. c. 13. p. 285. Field of the Church l. 4. c. 22. p. 242.

(49) *Ep. 178.*

(50) *De bono Perſeuer. c. 13. & Ser. de Temp. 44 & in Pſ. 85.*

(51) *De Temp. Ser. 91. And ſee Ser. 237.*

(52) *De Opif. miſſa. l. 2. ſect. 12.*

(53) *Againſt Rhem. teſt. in 1 Cor 10. 21.*

(54) *Ho. 37. in Euang and ſee 4 Dial. c. 57.*

(55) *Hiſt l. 4. c. 22.*

houres the Irons did without any outward help, fall loose from the said imprisoned persons. And afterwards they being set at liberty, & returned home, it fell out vpon obseruation and account of tyme, that as S. Bede saith of the one, *His hands were loosed specially at those tymes when Masse was celebrated for him*: And as S. Gregory saith of the other, *his wyfe calling to memory the dayes and houres, acknowledged him to be loosed euen then when for him she remembred the Sacrifice to be offered.* S. Bede mentioneth the names of the party, and of the Priest, and the place of his abode, affirming that it was tould him by credible *persons, who heard it from the party himselfe, whereupon* (saith he) *hauing so good proofe, I thought good to insert the same without any doubt into my Ecclesiasticall history.* And the other was so certainly knowne, that S. Gregory beginning to speake therof saith *Dearly beloued, I am perswaded that many of you do know that wherof now I will remember you.* Other like to these are recorded by (56) S. Gregory and Symeon (57) Metaphrastes. As also of the vision of Angels in tyme of the Sacrifice adoring, reported by (58) S. Chrysostome, Palladius, and Sozomene: which vision was also made to S. Chrysostome (59) himselfe, and by *him declared in priuate to his speciall spirituall friends.* These miracles are so forcible for our Catholicke doctrine, as that insteed of all other answere, Humfrey thinketh it (60) *Dotage to beleiue that Angels be there present:* and of the other mentioned by S. Bede, Fulke sayth, (61) *I weighe not worth a flye that tale you tell out of Bede, of him that had his Chaines fallen off in Masse time, that credulous and superstitious age had many such feigned miracles.* (62) And *the like fable* (saith he) *telleth Gregory, hom. 37. in Euang.* So prophanely and contemptuously do Heretickes, hauing their hartes hardened, thinke and speake of vndoubted miracles: and so basely do they thinke of S. Chrysostome, S. Gregory, and S. Bede, men reuerenced by all Christian posterity for their Learning, Iudgment and Sanctity. Lastly S. Austine relating, that, (63) *A house being haunted with euill Spirits &c. a Priest went and offered there the Sacrifice of Christes Body,* (for which the English Translation most corruptly sayth, *one went, prayed, and ministred the Communion*) *praying very earnestly that the vexation might cease, & by Gods mercy*

(56) *L. 4. Dial. c. 57.*
(57) *In Vita Ioan. Eleemosynarij. apud Surium. Tom. 1.*
(58) *De Sacerd. l. 6. c. 4. Pallad. Hist. Sanct. c. 20. & 71. Sozom. Hist. l. 6. c. 29.*
(59) *Nilus Monachus, in ep. ad Anastasium Episcopum.*
(60) *Iesuit. part. 1 p. 134.*
(61) *Against Purg. p. 111.*
(62) *Against Rhem. Test. in Heb. 10. 11. p. 416.*
(63) *De Ciu. Dei, l. 22, c. 8.*

it forthwith ceaſed. This miracle is confeſſed by the Centuriſtes (64) and Hoſpinian, as alſo by (65) Lauatherus, who reciting the ſtory verbatim, inferreth *that it is cleere that Superſtition began &c. as alſo to Pray, and Sacrifice for Soules.* And Moulin acknowledgeth this Miracle, (66) *of the houſe haunted with Spirits, and cleered by the Prieſt ſaying Maſſe in it.*

D. Reinolds confeſſeth. (67) *The Relation and mutuall dependance in which Aultar and Sacrifice are by nature linked together.* But Zepperus more particularly teacheth that, (68) *Aultars of ſtone and Hoſtes do confirme the Sacrifice of the Maſſe for the mutuall relation of Aultars and Sacrifices.* Now it is euident that the Ancient Fathers erected Aultars, and ſacrificed vpon them. S. Auſtine ſaith, (69) *We erect Aultars vpon which we Sacrifice to the one God.* (70) *Vpon the Aultar the Body of our Lord is offered.* (71) *We build Aultars to the God of Martyrs, although in memory of Martyrs: for what Bishop &c. ſtanding at the Aultar, hath any tyme ſaid, we offer to thee Peter, or Paul?* S. Gregory Nazianzen affirmeth, that, (72) *Aultars take their name from the moſt pure & vnbloudy Sacrifice.* Optatus asketh, (73) *what is the Aultar, but the ſeate of the Body, and Blond of Chriſt?* And in regard of this Relation, (74) Saint Auſtine and S. Gregory do call it, *The Sacrifice of the Aultar.* This was ſo certainly the beliefe and practiſe of the Ancient Fathers, that they are therfore in generall reproued by ſundry (75) Proteſtant writers.

(64) *Cent. 5. c. 6. Col. 684. Hoſp. Hiſt. Sacram. part. 1 p. 189. 391.*
(65) *De ſpectris, part. 3. c. 10. p. 254.*
(66) Defence &c. art. 9. p. 208.
(67) Conference &c p. 532.
(68) *Politia Eccleſ. l. 1. c. 18.*
(69) *De Ciuit. Dei. l. 22. c. 10.*
(70) *Ser. 11. de Sanctis.*
(71) *Cont. Fauſt. Manich. l. 20. c. 21.*
(72) *In Iulianum.*
(73) *L. 6. cont. Parmen.*
(74) *In Enchyr. c. 110. de cura pro mort. c. 18. Greg. in Luc. hom. 37.*
(75) Pet. Mart. in his Com. pla. in Engl. part. 4. p. 225.

SECT. IV.

That ſundry Proteſtants do teach, and allow a true, and externall Sacrifice in the tyme of the New Teſtament, euen the Sacrifice of the Maſſe.

HAuing proued before from Scriptures and Fathers, that Melchiſedech was truly a Prieſt, and that the Sacrifice which he offered was in bread and wyne, and that therein he was a true type of Chriſt his Prieſtood, and of the Sacrifice which he was to offer vnder the formes of bread and

wine; I will now examine what ſundry Prot. thinke heer-of: And firſt, I fynd Iohn Huſſe to affirme, (1) *That Chriſt is a Prieſt according to the Order of Melchiſedech who firſt offered bread and wyne: and Chriſt conſecrated bread and wyne into his Body and Bloud, the ſimilitude of which Sacrifice Melchiſedech ſent before &c: Melchiſedech offered bread and wyne Gen. 14. and Chriſt conſecrated bread and wyne into his Body and Bloud, offered it to God the Father, and committed it to his Diſciples to be offered.* He alſo calleth it, (2) *The Sacrament of the Aultar, and being a Prieſt, ſayd Maſſe, as Iohn Iohnſon acknowledgeth, euen to his dying day; to which his Maſſe the people during his laſt reſtraint reſorted, at his Hoſts houſe in Conſtance,* as is witneſſed by a Citizen (3) of Conſtance, who liued in that time: And we do not any where fynd him charged for impugning the Maſſe. So Papiſticall was Iohn Huſſe in the very Sacrifice of Maſſe.

Carthwright in his 1. Reply. the laſt. part. p. 264.

(1) *Ad Pſ. 109.*

(2) *Act. Mon. p. 209.*

(3) Huldericke Reichental. hiſtor. Teuton. de Concil. Conſtan.

To come now to Wiccliffe, Perzibrane recordeth that, (4) *Wiccliffe in his Booke de Apoſtaſia c. 18. approueth all the rytes of the Maße, from the beginning almoſt to the end, affirming that it is excellent and excellently declared, and concluding of all that ryte, and ſaying: It is certaine, that all ſuch things are ſo far forth laudable, as they do ſtir vp, that Chriſt may be more loued. Thus he &c. Wiccliffe celebrated his Maſſes, after the rite, and forme of the Church &c.*

(4) *Cap. 18.*

But no man ſpeaketh more plainly then Martin Luther, who auoucheth, that, (5) *Melchiſedech was a King, and a Prieſt, he offered bread and wyne alſo for the Patriarch Abraham and his family &c. But what is the Oblation of bread and wyne for Abraham? this expreſſeth the Prieſtood of Chriſt, from this tyme to the end of the world, in which tyme the Church offereth the Myſticall Sacrament of the Aultar, of his precious Body and Bloud.*

(5) *Ad Pſ. 110. Tom. 8. fol. 397.*

Heere Luther acknowledgeth Melchiſedech to haue beene a Prieſt, to haue offered bread and wine for Abraham, and therein to haue exerciſed the Prieſthood of Chriſt, and the Sacrament of the Aultar of his precious body and Bloud: which is the very ſame that Catholickes teach.

Andreas Craſtouius a learned Caluiniſt (6) acknowledgeth the Fathers generall opinion of Melchiſedechs Sacrifice of Bread and wyne, and in reguard of that their *Harmony*

(6) *De opificio Miſſæ Cont. Baller. l. 2. p. 28. ſect. 96.*

(as

(as he termeth it) or generall consent therin he professeth to be of their opinion: his wordes in the place before cited are, *It is not Lawfull for Christian Pastours to cast away the consent and Harmony of Interpretation, and that both for the neernes of the Apostles age, as also for the singular concord of all, which is had in all places &c. with the consent as it were of all: the sacred Oblation of Melchisedech is proposed, that not only for Abraham and his Souldiars, but also to God the vnbloudy Sacrifice may seeme to be offered Symbolically:* And immediatly after he answereth the Protestants common obiection, saying, *But if some Doctours affirme, Melchisedech to haue giuen to Abraham bread and wyne, yet they do not deny that primary Oblation which was made to God.* So that according to this Caluinist, all Fathers generally do interprete, that Melchisedech offered Sacrifice, and that his Sacrifice did represent the vnbloudy Sacrifice of Christ.

The Lord Cobham calleth the Eucharist, (7) *The Sacrament of the Aultar,* (8) *the Sacred Host*, and is no where charged with the contrary doctrine; but as M. Foxe witnesseth, (9) *His opinion, as the Papists thought at that tyme, was perfect concerning the Sacrament.* And it is euident that King Henry the 8. and the Church in his tyme did publickly maintayne the Masse, (10) *punishing the impugners thereof*; and yet neuertheles, the Prot. gladly acknowledge him for a (11) *Member of the Catholicke Church of Christ, and* (12) *the Church in his tyme for a true Church.*

(7) *Act. Mon. p. 105.*
(8) *Ib. p. 107.*
(9) *Ib p. 173.*
(10) *Act. Mon. p 186.*
(11) Fulke ag. Heskins, Saunders, p. 563. sect. 78.
(12) *Ib. p. 564.*

Iewell acknowledgeth that, (13) *Melchisedech by his bread and wyne signifyed the Sacrifice of the holy Communion:* so that with M. Iewel, the Prot. Communion is now a Sacrifice; or as M. Morton calleth it, *the Masse of Christ.* According to Melancthon, (14) *Melchisedech receyueth Abraham returning from the warre, and admitteth him to the Sacrifice, and blesseth him.* Vrbanus Rhegius testifyeth that (15) *Many there are who thinke a Sacrifice to be proued by the Apostle, 1. Cor. 10. where he dehorteth from the society of such as sacrifice to Idols by Arguments taken frō the beliefe of the Sacrifice vsed by the Iewes and Gentils for he seemeth to cōpare Sacrifice to Sacrifice as Chrysostome teacheth, & his Cōparison so to stand, that by it is gathered, Christians in the Lords Supper, to haue a certayne peculiar sacrifice whereby they are made partakers of our Lord.*

(13) Reply in Engl. p. 7.
(14) *In Concil. Theol. part. 2. p. 373.*
(15) *1. part. operum de Missa argotio. fol. 65.*

as the Idolaters by their abhominable Sacrifice, are made partakers of Diuels: which thing if it be so, it seemeth it may be answered, that in the Supper of Christians are the Body and Bloud of Christ, which are a holy a Sacrifice, but commemoratiue: So plainly doth he acknowledge the Eucharist to be no lesse truly and properly a Sacrifice, then were the Sacrifices of the Iewes, which were true Sacrifices, though they were commemoratiue, in respect of Christes Passion then to come, as ours is now a true Sacrifice, and yet Commemoratiue, in reguard of his Passion already past.

SECT. V.

Obiections from Scripture against the Sacrifice of the Masse answered.

(1) Against Reynolds. p. 84. 85.
(2) *Heb.* 7. 24.
(3) *Heb.* 7. 23.

D. (1) Whitakers vrgeth from S. Paul, that Christ (2) *Continueth for euer, and hath an euerlasting Priesthood*, wherfore no Priestes do succeede him, and consequently no Priesthood, no Sacrifice: for therfore in the Old law, *were Priests* (3) *multiplied, because that by death they were prohibited to continue.* Answ. We do not teach that Priestes do succeed to Christ, but only that they are his Vicars or Ministers, and that he by them doth truly offer Sacrifice, which doth no more derogate from Christ his Priesthood, then it doth from his being our (4) *Maister, King, Pastour, Preacher*; that others also are Maisters, and Kings, Pastours and Preachers: Yea therfore is he said to be a Priest for euer, (as is shewed before) because though not by himselfe, yet by other Priestes as his Ministers, he sacrificeth for euer. And as for S. Paul obiected (in proofe of the many prerogatiues of Christs Priesthood & Sacrifice before that of Aaron) he doth only exclude the multiplicity of Priestes in the same dignity & power; for in the old Law by reason of Aarons death succeeded Eleazarus, and to him Phinees &c. and so, as if Aaron had neuer dyed, none had succeeded him, and yet he liuing there were many other inferiour Priestes: so Christ neuer dying, none succee-

(4) *Mat.* 23. 10. *Isa.* 9. 7. *Luc.* 1. 3. *Mat.* 26. 31. Io. 10. 11. 14. *Luc.* 4. 18. *Eph.* 2. 17.

succeedeth him, which yet doth not hinder the being of the other true, yet inferiour Priestes. Againe, according to D. Whitakers owne Exposition, (5) *that property is ἀπαράβατος, (euerlasting) that passeth not away from one to another:* But who of vs euer affirmed Christ his Priesthood to haue departed away from him? Yea we all acknowledge that *he is a Priest for euer, according to the Order of Melchisedech.*

(5) Against Reynolds pag. 83.

Secondly, it is vrged that the Sacrifice of the Crosse is of infinite value, therfore all others are iniurious to it and superfluous I answere, this no more proueth the Sacrifice of the Masse to be iniurious to the Sacrifice of the Crosse, then it doth the like of all the Sacrifices of the old Testament, all which depended vpon the vertue of the Sacrifice of the Crosse, Christ being therfore called, (6) *the lambe slaine from the beginning of the world*; it being therfore of infinite value, doth only proue, that there is no neede for another, or the same Christ to dye againe, which maketh nothing against the multiplicity of Sacrifices, representing the said Sacrifice of the Crosse, and applying the fruite therof to vs: in one word, the Sacrifice of the Masse being no other but the same in substance with the Sacrifice of the Crosse, though in different manner offered vnder the formes of bread and wyne, which are truly turned into the Body and Bloud of Christ, wherupon it is called, *Hostia incruenta, an vnbloudy Sacrifice*; I say, the Sacrifice of the holy Masse, can be no wayes iniurious to the Sacrifice of the Crosse.

(6) Apoc. 13. 8.

But because this Obiection is much insisted vpon, in further Explanation therof, I say; 1. that the Catholicke belefe is, that our Sauiours Passion and death is in it selfe the sufficient and most accomplished price of our Redemption: And that the benefit therof is imparted to vs (as Prot. (7) also teach) by speciall meanes in that behalfe subordinate, as not only by faith and preaching of the word, but also, as many Prot. (8) acknowledge, by the *Sacraments*, and so most especially by the Sacrifice of the Masse in our opinion, which we affirme Christ to haue instituted to be to vs not any new Redemption; with which some Protestant falsly charge vs contrary to our (9) writings, and contrary to

(7) Chemnit. Exam part. 2. p. 21.
(8) Whiteg. Def. p. 527. Carthw. ib. p. 531. Hook. Eccl. Pol. l. 5. sect. 57. Couel. in Def. of Hook art. 14. p. 90. Bilson, true Diff. r. part. 4. p. 519. Chem. Exam. part. 2. p. 17.
(9) Bellar. de Missa, l. 2. c. 4.

to the Confeſſion had of vs by ſundry (10) Prot. in this behalfe; but onely as chiefe meanes appointed to continue the memory of his Oblation vpon the Croſſe, and the application of the generall vertue thereof to our particular neceſſities: to which very Doctrine ſundry Prot. do alſo aſſent. Sigwartus ſayth of this Sacrament, (11) *It is the organ, meanes, and inſtrument, by which the benefits of Chriſt may be conferred and applyed.* If you will believe Fulke, (12) *Every Prot. doth acknowledge the Miniſtration of the Sacrament to be a diſpenſation of the Sacrifice of Chriſts death.* Caluin affirmeth, that by the Sacrament, (13) *we are partakers of Redemption, and the benefit of the Sacrifice is applyed to vs.* And if ſome reply to this, that howſoeuer the Communicant may apply by *Fayth* Chriſts death to himſelfe, yet it ſeemeth hard, that the Prieſt ſhould in his Oblation make application of the benefit thereof, to, or for anyother. I anſwere, that the efficacy which we attribute as proper to the Maſſe, being not any new Redemption, is not hard but eaſy to be conceaued, the ſame being (in reguard of the like peculiar effect) ſemblable (though in a far tranſcendent ſort) vnto *Prayer*; which profiteth not onely the party praying, but (14) others alſo for whome it is made. Yea S. Paul ſpeaking of Sacrifices, ſayth moſt cleerly that, (15) *Euery high Prieſt &c. is appoynted for men in thoſe things that appertayne to God; that he may offer Guiftes and Sacrifices for ſinnes &c. and therefore he ought, as for the people ſo alſo for himſelfe to offer for ſinnes.* So many wayes is this common Obiection anſwered.

(10) *Vrſinus Commonefactio &c. p. 289.*

(11) *Diſp. Theol. diſp. 16. p. 145.*

(12) *Retenſtinet. p. 24.*

(13) *1 Cor. 11. 24.*

(14) *Iob. 42. 8 Philem v. 22. Rom. 15. 30. Iac 5. 16.*

(15) *Heb 5. 1. 3.*

The (16) third Obiection is that of the Apoſtle (17) *Nor that he ſhould offer himſelfe often, as the high Prieſt entreth into the Holyes euery yeare in the bloud of others.* And agayne, (18) *We are ſanctifyed by the Oblation of the Body of Ieſus Chriſt once.* And yet thirdly, (19) *By one Oblation hath he conſummated for euer them that are ſanctifyed.* And laſtly, (20) *Now there is not an Oblation for ſinnes.* Anſw. Theſe places are vnderſtood of the Sacrifice of the Croſſe, and ſo in the firſt place it is ſayd, (21) *Otherwyſe he ought to haue ſuffered often from the beginning of the world:* ſo that they do not exclude all Sacrifices, but only the iteration of the Sacrifice of the Croſſe by Chriſtes often ſuffering,

(16) *Rogers Doct. of the Art. art. 31. p. 184.*

(17) *Heb. 9. 25.*

(18) *Ib. c. 10. 10.*

(19) *Ib. ver. 14.*

(20) *Ib. 18.*

(21) *Heb. 9. 26.*

ring, for no more do the words import. And though by that one Sacrifice of the Croſſe, remiſſion of ſinnes be obtayned, that is, our Redemption wrought, and due ſatisfaction made to Gods Iuſtice for ſinne; yet this nothing more excludeth ſuch Sacrifices as repreſent, and apply vnto vs the Sacrifice of the Croſſe, then it doth exclude Baptiſme, the Euchariſte, preaching, prayer, and other meanes and Inſtruments, whereby the fruite and profit of the Croſſe is applied vnto vs. Beſides that vnderſtanding impugneth Chriſtes Prieſthood for euer; for which (22) it is neceſſary that he alſo may haue ſomething that he may offer, and for this expreſſe reaſon, *becauſe euery high Prieſt is appointed to offer.* Yea Prot. contrary to this their owne Obiection do confeſſe, that as now alſo in heauen (23) *Chriſt our Lord ſacrificeth for vs: and offereth a Sacrifice for ſinnes vnto the liuing God,* (euen) *himſelfe, alwayes an effectuall Sacrifice, & continuing ſtill* (24) *our Prieſt, executeth his office* (*of Prieſthood*) *before God in heauen.* And ſome Proſtants tell the Lutherans that, (25) *Whereſoeuer Chriſt is preſent, there doth he offer himſelfe in the ſight of his Father to obtayne vs remiſſion for his Sacrifice once offered vpon the Croſſe &c.* But according to Lutherans, *in the Maſſe he is corporally preſent, therfore in the Bread he preſenteth himſelfe to his Father for our Saluation no leſſe then in heauen.* And, the *Reall Preſence but admitted, the Sacrifice of Chriſtes Body doth thence neceſſarily follow.* In like ſort ſayth Altkircherus, (26) *From this foundation* (*of corporall preſence and eating*) *aſwell Adoration as Oblation of the Body and Bloud of Chriſt in Sacrifice muſt neceſſarily follow, and be graunted.* And he citeth Melancthon to ſay, (27) *If Chriſt be contayned in the Bread, why is he not to be adored and offered?* By all which it is cleere, that our vnbloudy Sacrifice doth nothing derogate from that one Sacrifice of the Croſſe.

(22) *Heb 8. 3.*

(23) Bulling. in Decad. in Engl. Dec. 4. Ser. 7. p. 707.

(24) *Ib. p.* 707.

(25) *Vrſinus in Commonef. fact. p.* 290.

(26) *De Myſtico &c. Sacrificio. p.* 2.

(27) *Ib. p.* 3.

Others obiect that we do not fynd in all the Scriptures that Chriſt or his Apoſtles ſaid Maſſe. Anſw. Chriſt himſelfe ſaid Maſſe at his laſt ſupper, when he ſaid, (28) *This is my Body which is giuen for you: This is the Chalice the New Teſtament in my Bloud which ſhalbe ſhed for you:* from which wordes we haue formerly proued Sacrifice. And ſeeing Chriſt at the ſame tyme commanded his Apoſtles ſaying, *Do this in remembrance*

(28) *Luke. 22. 19, 20.*

brance of me, it must either follow, that according to Christes appointment they did truly Sacrifice, or else that they did neglect his Commandemet, which were impious to thinke and iniurious to the Apostles. Besides, we expresly read of them, (29) *That they were ministring*, or according to the Greek, and Erasmus, *sacrificing*) *to our Lord*. And agreably S. Paul sayth, (30) *We haue an Aultar, wherof they haue not power to eate, which serue the Tabernacle*: now, Aultar and Sacrifice are Relatiues. So certaine it is that Christ at his last Supper, and the Apostles after, did offer Sacrifice, or celebrate Masse.

(29) *Act.* 13. 2.

(30) *Heb.* 13. 10.

Now may the Indifferent and Iudicious Reader iudge, whether in the tyme of the New Testament and Grace, the Church of Christ was not to haue a true externall and proper Sacrifice of the sacred Body and Bloud of Christ our Lord. Do not the sacred Scriptures expresly teach it? Do not the Ancient Fathers accordingly expound them? and moderne Prot. assent vnto them? Hath not the whole world vniuersally believed and daily vsed this Sacrifice? & God from Heauen confirmed it by many vndeniable Miracles? And was it euer impugned, but by Deuils, and their Ministers, knowne and branded Heretickes also for sundry other Errors? the Deuils in their owne person in this last age (God in his Iustice so permitting) vndertaking the matter. Let now the Christian Reader in Gods name, vpon the perill of his Soule for all Eternity, aduise with himselfe, whether he may with safety therof abandon the Masse, so many wayes proued to be Christes Institution and Command, and so betake himselfe to that Negatiue doctrine of impugning the Masse, which hath receiued its abortiue beginnings, and vntimely further grouth in manner before mentioned, so strange, fearfull, prodigious, and diabolicall.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXIV.

The true State of the Queſtion, concerning the Power giuen by Chriſt to Prieſts for the forgiuenes of ſinnes: and the neceſſity of Confeſſion.

Whether Chriſt our Sauiour gaue to his Apoſtles, and in them to Biſhops and Prieſts, true authority to forgiue and retayne ſinnes in the Sacrament of Pennance; or only to declare ſinnes to be forgiuen to thoſe that do beliewe: and whether Confeſſion of ſinnes in the ſayd Sacrament be neceſſary.

SECT. I.

Catholike Doctrine.

YOV haue ſeene before how Prot. do deny all Grace, or Remiſſion of Sinnes to be giuen by any Sacrament, making them only Seales, or ſignes of Grace; alſo that Baptiſme is not neceſſary to Saluation, but may be omitted; & that in the Euchariſt there is only bread and wyne: And the lyke they do in the Sacrament of Pennance, depriuing it of all efficacy for the remiſſion of ſinnes. But in condemnation thereof the Catho-

licke Church teacheth, that, (1) *Our Lord did then chiefly ordayne the Sacrament of Pennance, when rising from death, he breathed vpon his Disciples saying, Receaue yee the holy Ghost, whose sins you shall forgiue they are forgiuen them and whose you shall retayne, they are retayned By which so notable act, and words so playne, the consent of all Fathers hath alwayes vnderstood, power of remitting & retayning sinnes to haue beene communicated to the Apostles, and their lawfull Successours.* The Church further (2) *teacheth, the forme of the Sacrament of Pennance &c. to be placed in these wordes: I absolue thee &c. The actes of the Penitent himselfe, to wit, Contrition, Confession, and Satisfaction, are as it were the matter of this Sacrament &c.* (3) *Contrition is sorrow of mynd and detestation of sinne committed, with purpose to sinne no more &c.* (4) *From the Institution of the Sacrament of Pennance &c. all the Church hath euer vnderstood, entyre Confession of sinnes to haue beene also ordayned by our Lord, & to be necessary by Gods Law to all that haue fallen after Baptisme &c. Concerning Satisfaction, the Church* (5) *declareth, that it is altogether false and different from the word of God (to affirme) the fault is neuer forgiuen by our Lord, but all the punishment is also pardoned &c.* And therefore she further teacheth, that, (6) *so great is the bounty of Gods munificence, that we may not only satisfy God the Father through Christ Iesus with punishments voluntarily by our selues vndertaken for the reuenge of sinne, or imposed by sentence of the Priest, according to the measure of the fault: but also which is the greatest argument of loue, by temporall punishments inflicted by God, and by vs patiently suffered.*

(1) 1. Concil. Trident. Sess. 14. Cap. 1.
(2) Cap. 3.
(3) Cap. 4.
(4) Cap. 3.
(5) Cap 8.
(6) Cap. 9.

In the Councell Cabilonense it is thus decreed, (7) *Concerning the Pennance of sinnes, which is the Cure of the Soule, we iudge it profitable to all men; and that Pennance be appointed to Penitents by Priests, Confession being made &c.* In the Councell of Florence it is defyned that, (8) *Pennance is the fourth Sacrament whose as it were matter are the actes of the Penitent, which are distinguished into three parts, the 1. Contrition of the hart &c. the 2. Confession of the mouth &c. the 3. satisfaction for sinnes according to the sentence of the Priest &c. The forme of this Sacrament are the words of Absolution, which the Priest vttereth, when he sayth: I absolue thee &c. The Minister of this Sacrament is the Priest, hauing authority to absolue, either ordinary, or by Commission of Superiours.*

(7) Can. 8.
(8) Decret. Eugenij PP.

Accor-

According to theſe Councels all (9) Catholickes generally belieue, that the Sacrament of Pennance is truly and properly a Sacrament: that the Prieſt hath Authority from God therein to forgiue ſinne: and that Confeſſion of ſinnes is therefore neceſſary.

(9) *Bellar. de Pœnitent. l. 1. c. 8. &c. Rhem. Teſt. in Ioan. 20. 22. 23.*

Pointes Diſputable.

All Catholiks belieuing that Contrition is a Cauſe of remiſſion of ſinne, yet (10) ſome teach, that it cauſeth as a diſpoſition, not as truly deſeruing the ſame: But (11) others more probably teach, that it is not only a Diſpoſition, but truly deſeruing of congruity Iuſtification. (12) Some place the eſſence of this Sacrament only in the Abſolution. (13) Others in Abſolution & Confeſſion. (14) Others generally in Abſolution, Contrition, and Confeſſion as eſſentiall, and in Satisfaction as a part only integrall.

(10) *Capreol. in 2. Diſt. 40. q. Vnica. Dom à Soto. l. 2. de Nat. & Gra. c. 4.*
(11) *Magiſter. Sent. 2 l. Sent. Diſt. 17. S. Tho in 2. Diſt. 27 q. 4.*
(12) *Scotus in 4. Diſt. 16. q 1.*
(13) *Durand. Diſt. 14. q. 2. Gabr. diſt. 14. q. 1. art. 2.*
(14) *Sotus. Diſt. 14. q. 2. art. 2.*

Some (15) thinke, that the Penient is not bound to accept the Pennance impoſed by the Prieſt, but may referre himſelfe to Purgatory: but if he do accept thereof, then is he bound to performe it. (16) Others, that neyther is he bound to accept thereof, and if he do, yet is he not bound to performe it. But (17) others more generally teach, that the Penitent is both bound to accept, and performe his Pennance impoſed by the Prieſt.

(15) *Scotus in 4. Diſt. 18. Nauar. in Man. c. 26. n 20.*
(16) *Caiet. q. 2. de Satisfact.*
(17) *Magiſt. Sent. in 4. Diſt. 16. 18. S. Tho. eadem Diſt. q 1. art. 3.*

Proteſtants Vntruthes.

Luther bluſheth not to auouch that, (18) *Our Babylon* (meaning the Catholicke Church) *is not content with this, ſhe hath alſo ſo extinguiſhed faith, as that with ſhamles forhead ſhe denieth it to be neceſſary in this Sacrament, yea with Antichriſtian impiety ſhe defyneth it Hereſy. If any ſhall affirme faith to be neceſſary.* But this is to be moſt vntrue, Luther himſelfe doth acknowledge in theſe words. (19) *This I haue done by that Doctrine, Pennance is of no waight, vnleſſe it be done in Faith and Charity, which themſelues alſo teach, only that they neither know or teach, what is*

(18) *Captiu. Babyl. Cap. de Pœn.*

(19) *Aduerſus execrab. Antichriſti Bullam, de ſexto Art.*

is Faith, or what is Charity. So cleerly doth Luther preue himselfe a lyar.

He also accuseth vs to teach that, (20) *Contrition goeth before the faith of promise, and is much more profitable, as not being a worke, but merit of faith.* But all Catholickes teach, that Contrition followeth faith, and that faith is so the guift of God, as that it cannot be gayned by Contrition, or any other worke, as of merit.

(20) L. de Captiu. Babyl. cap. de Pœnit.

He (21) affirmeth lykewise that we make no mention in the Sacrament of Confession of the merit of Christ, but only inculcate humane Satisfactions; which he proueth by the forme of Absolution which Catholickes vse. But this is so absurdly false, that in the very forme of Absolution which Luther himselfe setteth downe in the same place, & which Hesshusius reciteth out of Luther, the first words are, (22) *The merit of Christs Passion &c.*

(21) In Comment. Epist. ad Gal.

(22) L. de Error. Pontif. loc. 9. n. 37.

Melancthon (23) in sundry places affirmeth vs to teach, sinnes to be forgiuen not by fayth, but by Charity, workes, and satisfactions: whereas we teach that sinne is to be forgiuen by Absolution, God applying the merits of Christ by the Ministery of Priestes, and this gratis, not for any merit, or worke of Contrition, or other workes of ours.

(23) In Confess. August. art. 12. & in Apol. ad art. 12.

Caluin (24) affirmeth, that we make Pennance to cõsist in externall Exercises, *But of the interiour renouation of the mynd which draweth with it true amendment of life, a strange silence.* But himselfe presently after in the same place maketh himselfe a lyar, by these wordes, *wish them there is much speach of Contrition and Attrition.* He also introduceth Catholickes to say, (25) *For as much as concerneth Confession it is to be obserued, that the matter is by Gods Law, but the forme by Positiue Law.* But no Catholike euer writ, that the forme of Absolution was by Positiue Law. He also falsly auoucheth that, (26) *The Aduersaries do not shew any necessity of Confession to haue beene imposed vpon the faythfull before Innocent the 3.* But Innocent the 3. only declareth that none haue power to administer this Sacrament by Gods Law, but only such as haue Iurisdiction ouer others. Chemnitius affirmeth that (27) *Lombard first made of Pennance a Sacrament.* But this to be most vntrue may be seene in S. (28) Austine.

(24) Instit. l. 3. c. 4. §. 1.

(25) In Antid. art. Paris. art. 3.

(26) De necess. reform. Eccl. p. 60.

(27) Exam. 2. part. p. 955.

(28) Ep 180. ad Dioscor.

Pre-

Proteſtant Doctrine.

The Engliſh Prot. Church decreeth, that (29) *There are two Sacraments ordayned by Chriſt &c Baptiſme, and the Supper of the Lord. Thoſe commonly called Sacraments, that is, Confirmation, Pennance &c. are not to be counted for Sacraments of the Goſpell &c. for that they haue not any Ceremony or viſible ſigne ordayned by God.* And heereupon Prot. teach, that, (30) *Eccleſiaſticall Miniſters haue only power graunted to them, to declare and pronounce Remiſsion of ſinnes according to the will of God, and do not properly in their owne power abſolue or releaſe ſinnes:* (31) *They do not reconcile men to God, but pray them to be reconcyled.*

(29) *Art.* 25.

(30) Willet. Synop. Controu. 5. q. 4.

(31) *Ib p.* 211.

Calain thinketh that, (32) *The Law eſtablished for auricular Confeſsion is diabolicall.* Iewel, (33) *We ſay, that it is neyther ordayned by Chriſt, nor is neceſſary to ſaluation, that priuate Confeſsion be made to the Miniſter.* So that Prot. deny the Sacrament of Pennance, and all neceſſity of Confeſsion.

(32) *In refut. Catbol. p.* 384.

(33) Defence of the Apol. p. 132.

Proteſtants agree with Ancient Hereticks.

S. Ambroſe affirmeth of the Nouatian Hereticks, that, (34) *They ſay they giue the reuerence to God, to whome alone they reſerue the power of forgiuing ſinnes, but none do greater iniury vnto him, then thoſe who will breake his Commandements: for ſeeing our Lord himſelf ein his Ghoſpel hath ſayd, Receyue you the Holy Ghoſt, whoſe ſinnes you ſhall remit they ſhalbe remitted, who doth more honour him, he who obeyeth his Commandements, or he who reſiſteth?* And to omit the like cenſure giuen by (35) Pacianus againſt Sympronianus the Nouatian, Socrates relateth the Hereticke Aceſius to haue ſayd, that (36) *Sinners were to be inuited to Pennance, but the hope of remiſsion they were not to haue from Prieſtes, but from God alone, who hath power to forgiue ſinnes: which when he had ſpoken, the Emperour ſayd, O Aceſius, ſet vp a ladder, and if thou canſt, aſcend alone to heauen.* This Hiſtory is ſo true, that it is confeſſed by (37) Oſiander, Chemnitius, and the Century writers. And M. Dillingham granteth that, (38) *The Nouatians did reſerue to God alone, the power of forgiuing ſinnes.* The Mon-

(34) *L.* 1. *de Pœnit. c.* 7. *See Cypr. l.* 4. *Ep.* 2.

(35) *Ep.* 2. *ad Sympron.*

(36) *Hiſt. tripart. l.* 2. *c.* 13.

(37) *Cent.* 4. *p.* 129. *Chem. Exam part.* 2. *p.* 188. *& part.* 2. *p.* 193. *Cent.* 4. *Col.* 655.

(38) *Diſp. de natura Pœnit. p.* 12.

Montaniſts are alſo reproued by S. (39) Hierome, for denying Confeſſion; as alſo the Meſſalians by S. (40) Damaſcene.

(39) Ep. ad Marcell.
(40) L. de hær. c. 80.

And as concerning Pennance enioined after Confeſſion by the Prieſt, Theodoret reproueth the Heretickes Audiani, for that, (41) *They giue remiſsion to ſuch as are confeſſed without preſcribing tyme for Pennance, as the lawes of the Church command.* The Iacobites were condemned Anno 600. for affirming that, (42) *We are to confeſſe our ſinnes to God onely: and that Confeſsion of ſinnes to a Prieſt is not needfull.* So fully do Proteſtants ſymbolize with Ancient Heretickes.

(41) L. 4 hær. Fab. de Audianis.
(42) Aſſeman. de Caſt. aduer. hær. l. 4 c. de Confeſſ and the Prot. Author of Catholicke Traditions. p 116.

Proteſtant Errours.

Danæus affirmeth that, (43) *Chriſt the Sonne of Man, & conuerſing then vpon Earth, forgaue ſinnes, but not as he was man, but as he was true God: euen as in the ſame diuine nature he wrought miracles, not as he was man.* Yea ſayth Perkins (44) *Chriſt himſelfe as he was Man could not worke a miracle.* It is no meruayle then if Prot. deny to Priests power to forgiue ſinnes, when they deny it to Chriſt, as man.

(43) Controu. 4. c. 9. p. 195.
(44) In Gal. 3. 5.

According to Luther, (45) *Prieſtes by no right, but damnable abuſe, doe vſe in Confeſsions and Excommunications the office of binding and looſing; for all we who are Chriſtians, haue the Common office of the keyes.* And elſwere he affirmeth, (46) that a woman or Child aſwell as a Biſhop or Pope, may abſolue in the Sacrament of Pennance: wherin he followeth the Pepuzian Heretickes condemned by S. Auguſtine, (47) for that they gaue to women the Priuiledge to be made Prieſtes. But Luther proceedeth yet further, directing vs thus, (48 *Be new certaine, and let him acknowledge himſelfe whoſoeuer knoweth himſelfe to be a Chriſtian that we are all Prieſtes alike, that is, haue the ſame power in the word and euery Sacrament.* So that euery Shoomaker may aſwell adminiſter any Sacrament, as any Biſhop or Prieſt.

(45) Ep: ad Senatum Pragenſem.
(46) Art. 23 à Leon. decimo Damnato.
(47) L. de hær. c. 27.
(48) L. de Capt. Babyl. fol. 86.

SECT.

SECT. II.

It is proued by Scriptures that Christ gaue to his Apoſtles, and in them to Bishops and Prieſtes, true authority to forgiue and retayne ſinnes, in the Sacrament of Pennance: And that Confeſſion of ſinnes is neceſſary.

CHriſt our Sauiour claymed and receyued as being man power and authority to remit ſinne here vpon Earth, in ſo much that when certaine of the Scribes blaſphemed againſt him (as Prot. Miniſters do now calumniate Catholicke Prieſtes) ſaying, (1) *who can forgiue ſinnes but only God?*) he did therfore miraculouſly cure the man ſicke of the Palſy, (2) *that they might know, that the Sonne of man hath power in Earth to forgiue ſinnes:* Wherupon (3) *the multitudes &c. glorifyed God, that gaue ſuch power vnto men.* Neither is it probable or any way poſſible, that he receiued this power only for himſelfe, or for his owne aboad here with vs vpon Earth, but to communicate the ſame ouer to his Church, to which end he accordingly ſaid to his Apoſtles, (4) *As my Father ſent me, I alſo ſend you.*

(1) *Mar.* 2. 7.
(2) *Mat.* 9. 6. *Mar.* 2. 10.
(3) *Mat.* 8. 9.
(4) *Io.* 20. 21.

Now, that Prieſtes haue power from Chriſt to forgiue ſinne, it may be proued from the promiſe and performance of our Sauiour vnto the Prince of the Apoſtles S. Peter, that from him it might be deriued to all the reſt. (5) *I will giue to thee the keyes of the kingdome of Heauen, and whatſoeuer thou ſhalt bynd vpon Earth, it ſhalbe bound alſo in the heauens; and whatſoeuer thou ſhalt looſe in Earth, it ſhalbe looſed alſo in the heauens:* the like power alſo is promiſed to the reſt of the Apoſtles, euen by our Sauiour himſelfe ſaying, (6) *Amen I ſay to you, whatſoeuer you ſhall bynd vpon Earth ſhalbe bound alſo in heauen, and whatſoeuer you ſhall looſe vpon Earth ſhalbe looſed alſo in heauen.* Now that by bynding and looſing is meant forgiuing, and not forgiuing of ſinnes, it is proued by another place in which Chriſt after his Reſurrection repeated againe and confirmed the ſame power, ſaying vnto them, (7) *Peace be to you, as my Father*

(5) *Mat.* 16. 19.
(6) *Mat.* 18. 18.
(7) *Io.* 20. 22. 23.

 Father

Father hath ſent me, I alſo do ſend you. When he had ſaid this, he breathed vpon them, and he ſaid vnto them, Receyue ye the holy Ghoſt, whoſe ſinnes you ſhall forgiue they are forgiuen them, and whoſe you ſhall retaine they are retained. To which purpoſe S. Paul ſaith of God, (8) *who hath giuen vs the miniſtery of Reconciliation &c. and hath put in vs the word of Reconciliation; for Chriſt therfore we are Legates.* This paſſage of Scripture is ſo cleere to proue the point in queſtion, that euery particular Circumſtance therof doth moſt ſtrongly ſeeme to confirme it; as firſt the peace he pronounced vnto them, *Peace be vnto you*; and what greater peace, then peace in their owne Conſcience, by forgiuing them their ſinnes; as alſo to be cauſers, though miniſteriall, of this peace vnto others, by forgiuing their ſinnes. 2. *As my Father ſent me, ſo I ſend you*; here is their miſſion, and to what end ſerued their miſſion, if with it, they did not bring others remiſſion of their ſinnes, ſince they were ſent as Chriſt was ſent, but Chriſt was ſent to remit ſinnes, therfore ſo were the Apoſtles alſo: and yet the dignity and difference betwixt Chriſt and them is ſufficiently reſerued and retayned in this, that Chriſt was principall, they miniſteriall in diſpenſing this power of remiſſion of ſinnes: he of himſelfe, they vnder him: he by his owne proper power, which was one with his Fathers, they with power from him. 3. *He breathed vpon them and ſaid, receiue you the holy Ghoſt*; which circumſtance noteth, and muſt needs of neceſſity ſignify, a wonderfull great power giuen vnto them, which if it be not the power to forgiue ſinnes, but only to declare remiſſion of ſinnes, as Prot. teach; what great power was then giuen vnto them by Chriſtes breathing vpon them, ſince euery man & woman may do this? Laſtly after all, followeth the full power giuen; *Whoſe ſinnes you forgiue they are forgiuen, whoſe ſinnes you retaine they are retained:* ſo plaine you ſee is the letter of the Text, ſo ſtronge euery Circumſtance of facte, as giuing them his *peace, ſending them, breathing vpon them, giuing them the Holy Ghoſt, with authority and commiſſion pronounced to forgiue ſinnes.*

(8) 2. Cor. 5. 18. 19. 20.

Now, that by theſe texts is giuen to the Apoſtles not only authority to preach, and to declare to the faythfull & to

to the Penitent remiſſion of their ſinnes, and to the impenitent punishment and damnation, but euen truly and properly power and authority to remit and retayne ſinnes, is proued further, by the word *keyes*, which are not accuſtomed to be made or giuē to ſignify a Dore to be ſhut or open, but indeed to open and ſhut the ſame. *Keyes* alſo are giuen to Magiſtrates in token of true power and authority giuen thereby: As when of our Sauiour it is ſayd, (9) *He that hath the key of Dauid, he that openeth and no man ſhutteth, ſhutteth and no man openeth*, all vnderſtand by *Key*, true power which Chriſt hath to abſolue and bynd. Wherefore as no man can enter into a houſe ſhut, vnles he which hath the key openeth the doore; ſo no man to whome heauen through ſinne is ſhut, can enter thereinto, but by the miniſtery of Prieſts, to whom the keies thereof are giuen. 2. To *bynd* and *looſe*, doth not ſignify to declare, but truly to caſt on, or take off bands, or fetters; neither otherwiſe would our Sauiour haue ſaid, *whatſoeuer you ſhall looſe, ſhalbe looſed*, but, whatſoeuer you ſhall looſe, was looſed before, which alſo of it ſelfe is abſurd, as were likewiſe to ſay, whoſe ſinnes you ſhall remitte, they were remitted. 3. The ſame is plaine by thoſe words, *whoſe ſinnes you ſhall retaine they be retained:* for to *retaine*, is nothing elſe but not to remitte, wherfore remiſſion is denyed to them, to whom the Prieſt will not remitte; 4. Euery Infidell, Hereticke, woman, or Child, may declare remiſſion of ſinnes to ſuch as belieue and repent, and ſo herby haue as full authority to abſolue, as the Apoſtles themſelues. 5. And in vaine were abſolution giuen to the deafe, or to ſuch as by violence of ſicknes are deſtitute of ſenſe, ſeeing they cannot conceiue this declaration, and yet to theſe in the Ancient Church was Abſolution vſuall to be giuen. By this we may ſee how ridiculous Zwinglius is, when he ſaith, (10) *The keies are nothing elſe then the pure word of God, and the ſincere preaching of the Ghoſpell*; And, (11) *The keyes are nothing elſe then the faith of the Ghoſpell*. (12) *We learne in Luke*: *To looſe and to bynd, to be nothing elſe then to preach the Ghoſpell*: And (13) *The words of bynding and looſing ſignify nothing elſe then to belieue, and not to belieue* But by the like liberty a man may proue an apple to be an egge,

(9) *Apoc. 3. 7.*

(10) *Tom. 2. in Expoſit. Art. 10. fol. 92.*

(11) *In Exegeſi fol. 138.*

(12) *In Expoſit. Art. 30. fol. 91.*

(13) *Apud Sabinum lib. 11. Theol. Cal. Art. 9. fol. 69.*

and an Egge to be an Oyſter.

A ſecond proofe for this power in Prieſtes to forgiue ſinnes, may be the Common practiſe of the Church, and Chriſtians in S. Paul his tyme, confeſſing their ſinnes, for it is ſaid, (14) *And many of them that beleiued, came confeſsing and declaring their deedes. And many of them that had followed curious things, brought togeather their bookes, and burnt them before all.* Here it is euident, that they confeſſed themſelues not only in generall to be ſinners, but their *deeds* in ſpeciall, amongſt which was their *following of curious things*, to wit, curious & vnlawfull ſciences, as witchraft, negromancy, and other meanes of diuination, by ſoothſaying, figure-caſting, interpretation of dreames, and the like, for which cauſe they *burned their bookes* of Curioſity, being enioyned ſo to do by S. Paul, who had heard their Confeſsions. Neither may it be ſaid, that they confeſſed ſome of their mortall ſinnes, and not all, for beſides that no cauſe can be aſsigned, why they ſhould be boũd to confeſſe ſome ſinnes and not others, wherſoeuer the Scripture ſpeaketh abſolutely of ſinnes, it is, and ought to be vnderſtood of all, as (15) *Redeeme thy ſinnes with Almes*, that is, All thy ſinnes. Againe, (16) *He will ſaue his people from their ſinnes*: Laſtly, (17) *Thy ſinnes are forgiuen thee*, and the like, where to vnderſtand the word *ſinnes*, of ſome, and not of all, were abſurd. This place is ſo cleere for Confeſsion of ſinnes, that Caluin acknowledgeth, that (18) *Of their owne accord they Confeſſed the ſinnes of their life paſt*: But as Caluin cannot proue that they confeſſed their ſinnes only of their owne accord; ſo may euery one iudge that neither they nor others, would make Confeſsion of their ſecret ſinnes, if there were not a iuſt neceſsity therin, Confeſsion being a thing ſo contrary to mans naturall inclination: Howſoeuer, Caluin heere is inforced to acknowledge, that they confeſſed the ſinnes of their life paſte.

(14) *Act.* 19. 18. 19.

(15) *Dan.* 4. 24.

(16) *Mat.* 1. 21.

(17) *Luc.* 7. 48

(18) *In Act. Apoſt. c.* 19. 18. *p.* 299.

This Confeſsion in particular was prefigured in the ould Teſtament: for wheras ſeuerall Sacrifices were appointed to be offered for ſeuerall ſinnes, as you ſhall read in diuers places of Scripture of the (19) old Teſtament, for which the Prieſt was appointed to offer and make attonement,

(19) *Leuit.* 4. 2. 3. 5. 14. & 6. 12. 25 & *Num.* 15 28. 33. 34. 35.

nement (20). This the Priest could not do, vnlesse the party offending confessed his seuerall sinnes vnto him: Yea it was expressly Commanded, (21) *That man or woman when they shall do any of all the sinnes, that are wont to chance to men, and by negligence haue transgressed the Comandement of the Lord. & haue offended, they shall confesse their sinne, & restore the principall vnto him selfe.*

(20) *Leuit.4. 3.2c.& 5. 6. 13. & 6. 7.*
(21) *Num.5. 6 7.*

M. Morton to euade the force of this Argument, alleadgeth Lira as saying, (22) *The people of the old Testament did not make Confession to the Priest of their particular sinnes*; in proofe wherof he citeth *Lyra in Leuit. c.16. 21.* as saying of the people, *In veteri lege non omnia explicabant.* But this is M. Mortons vonted forgery and abuse of Authors, for Lyra speaketh not there, with *explicabant*, as in the plurall number, or of the peoples owne confessing, but only of the Priest and his generall Confession made to God for the people saying, *Confiteatur omnes iniquitates non explicando omnia particulariter: let him confesse all iniquities, not expressing all things particularly:* because he could not then haue either tyme to recite the peoples many sinnes, or memory to retaine each mans offences in particular. Read but Lyra in the place cited, and you will see iust cause euer to looke to M. Mortons fingers.

(22) *Appeale p.303.*

Answerably to this practise of the old Testament it is sayd of S. Iohn Baptist, (23) *then went forth to him Hierusalem and all Iewry, and all the Country about Iordan, and were baptized of him in Iordan confessing their sinnes.* For the holy Baptist being a forerunner of Christ, did prepare the way to Christ & his Sacraments, not only by his Baptisme, but by inducing the people to Confession of their sinnes, which was not to acknowldge themselues in generall to be sinners, but also to vtter in particular euery man his sinnes.

(23) *Mat 3.5. & Mar.1.5.*

Caluin much troubleth himselfe, but cannot auoyde the force of this place in his answere thereto, and thereupon acknowledgeth, that (24) *Before Baptisme Confession of sinnes is required*, and that Baptisme ought not to be administred to them of yeares, *nisi examine prius habito*, but after examination of *Conscience.* So confessedly is it, that the Sacrament of Pennance and confession of sinnes, was prefigured in the Old Testament.

(24) *In Harm. in Mat.3.6.p.32.*

Besides these pregnant places of Scripture, reason doth convince, that no worldly power or Policy of man could haue introduced Confession into the Church, for if Confession had beene mans Inuention, and not the Institution God, then doubtles the same would haue beene earnestly contradicted at the first, seeing thereby euen the greatest Princes and Kings are forced to lay open to Priests their secretest, fowlest, and most enormous sinnes, and to vndergoe and performe all such penalty as shalbe by the Priest imposed vpon thē for the same, which certainly being a thing so repugant to mans nature, is the heauiest burden in the Catholicke Church. Neyther is it probable, that the Pastours of the Church durst euer haue endeauoured the enacting of so burdēsome a law, or that the people of the world could haue beene persuaded and brought thereunto, if this Sacrament of Pennance had not beene instituted by Christ, and put in execution by the Apostles, and the Primitiue Church. Add lastly, that seeing Priests are thus appointed by Christ as Iudges, that therefore particular Confession of sinnes is to be made vnto them: Otherwise their Iudgment would be no other then of a blynd mans, concerning colours, or a deafe mans, touching musicke.

SECT. III.

That the Fathers expound the Scriptures in proofe of Priests authority to retayne or remit sinne: And for the necessity of Confession vnto Priests.

THe Fathers do most cleerly expound the Scriptures in this behalfe, so S. Austine adulting incontinent persons sayth, (1) *If you haue layn with any others besyds your wyues, do pennance such as is done in the Church, that the Church may pray for you. Let no man say to himselfe, I do it secretly, I do it to God, God who pardoneth me, knoweth that I do it in my hart. Therfore without cause is it sayd,* (2) *what things you shall loose vpon Earth, shalbe loosed in heauen? Then without cause are the keyes giuen to the Church of God? we*

(1) L. 50. homiliarum, ho. 49. c. 3. See ho. 11. & 41.

(2) Mat. 18. 18.

we make frustrate the Ghospell of God, we make frustrate the wordes of Christ, we promise to you what he deyeth? Agayne, (3) *There are some who thinke it sufficeth them to saluation, if they confesse their sinnes to God alone, to whome nothing is bidden &c. for they will not, or are ashamed, or scorne, to shew themselues to Priests, whome yet our Lord appointed by his Law-giuer to discerne betweene Leaper & Leaper. But I would not haue thee deceyued with that opinion, that thou shouldest be confounded to Confesse before the Vicar of our Lord, languishing for shame, or stubborne for Anger: for his iudgement is humbly to be vndergone, woome our Lord doth not disdayne to be his Vicar. Therefore aske the Priest to come vnto thee, and make him wholly partaker of thy Conscience. Let not that superstition of dreamers seduce thee, which in visiting auoucheth, that Confession of sinnes to God doth saue, the Priest not consulted withall. But we do not deny, but that Confession of sinnes is to be often made to God &c. But we witnes, & sound Doctrine doth testify it &c. that first thou needest the wholesome sentence of the Priest, who may be a Mediatour to thy God; otherwise how should the diuine Answere be perfected, both vnder the law, and vnder grace,* (4) *Go and shew your selues to the Priests? how should be fulfilled,* (5) *Confesse your sinnes one to another? Therefore let the Priest be called, in Gods place to Iudge of thy wounds, and make knowne to him thy wayes, and he will giue thee the Preseruatiue of Reconciliation.* As also, (6) *Before he confessed he was bidden, but when he confesseth, he cometh forth out of darknes to light; And when he hath confessed, what is sayd to the Ministers? That which was sayd at the Graue of Lazarus, Loose him and let him goe: how? It is sayd to the Apostles the Ministers, whatsoeuer you shall loose vpon Earth, shalbe loosed also in heauen.* By which it appeareth, that Saint Austine expounding sundry Texts of Scripture, teacheth Confession to God alone is not sufficient, but that it must be also made to Priestes, to whome God hath giuen power to absolue from sinne.

(3) *L. 2. de Visit. infirm. c. 4. See Tract. 49. in Ioan. c. 11 & in Ps. 101. con. 2.*

(4) *Leuit. 14. 2. Mat 8. 4.*

(5) *Iac. 5. 16.*

(6) *In Ioan. Tract. 12. & de vera & falsa Pœnitentia, c. 10.*

S. Ambrose reporteth the Nouatian Heretickes to say accordingly as Prot. still say. (7) *They reserue the honour to God, to whome only they attribute power of remitting sinne: But none do him greater iniury, then they who &c. dissolue the charge committed, for seeing himselfe said &c. whose sinnes you forgiue they are forgiuen, who therefore more honoureth him, whether he that obeyeth his Comman-*

(7) *L. 2. de Pœnit. c. 2.*

Commandement, or he that resisteth? S. Hierome teacheth that,

(8) In Mat. c.16. (8) The Bishop or Priest according to his office when he hath heard the variety of sinnes, knoweth who is to be bound, and who is to be loosed.

S. Chrisostome speaking of the great dignity of Priesthood affirmeth, that, (9) who dwell vpon Earth, and are conuersant therein, to them is committed the dispensing of those things which are in heauen: to them is granted that power which God would not giue to Angels or Archangels; for to them it is not said, Whatsoeuer you shall bynd vpon Earth, shalbe bound in heauen, and whatsoeuer you shall loose vpon Earth, shalbe loosed also in heauen. Earthly Princes haue indeed power of bynding, but the Bodies only; but this binding of Priests which I speake of, toucheth the soule it selfe, and reacheth to the heauens: In so much, that whatsoeuer the Priests do vpon Earth, the same God alloweth in heauen. And agayne, (10) To the Priest a Throne is placed in the heauens, and he hath authority to giue sentence of heauenly matters. Who sayth so? The King of heauen himselfe, Whatsoeuer you shall bynd vpon Earth, shalbe bound also in heauen, and whatsoeuer you shall loose vpon Earth, shallbe also loosed in heauen. What can be compared with this honour? Or what can be spoken more plainly against Protestants?

(9) L.3. de Sacerd.

(10) Ho.5. de verbis Isaiæ. Vidi Dominum

According to Pacianus, (11) Neuer would God threaten him that doth not repent, vnles he would pardon the Penitent: Only God (thou sayest) can do this; but what he doth by his Priests, is his power: for what is that which he sayth to his Apostles whatsoeuer you shal bynd on Earth &c. wherefore this, if it were not lawfull for men to bynd and loose? Was this only Lawfull to the Apostles alone? then to them alone is it lawfull to baptize, and to giue the holy Ghost &c.

(11) Ep. 1.

S. Basil beleueth that, (12) Sinnes of necessity are to be opened to them, to whome the dispensing of the Mysteries of God is committed: for we see these ancient to haue followed this so meen Penance, when it is written euen in the Ghospell (13) that they confessed their sinnes to Iohn, and in the Acts, (14) to the Apostles themselues &c. The Fathers Doctrine heerein is so cleere, that the Centuristes speaking of those ancientest tymes of Cyprian and Tertullian affirme that, (15) They gaue Absolution from sinnes thus, If any did Pennance, they should first confesse their sinne. for so doth Tertullian in his Booke, De Pœnitentia, greatly vrge Confession.

(12) In regulis Breuioribus. Interrog. 2. 268.
(13) Mat 3. 6.
(14) Act. 19. 18.
(15) Cent. 3. c.6. Col. 127. & Cent 4. c. 6. Col. 425.

And

And it appeareth by certaine places of Cyprian, that Priuate Confeſsion was vſuall, wherin they Confeſſed their ſinnes and wicked thoughts, as in Ser. 5. de lapſis. & l. 3. Epiſt. ep. 14. & 16. where he expreſly ſayth of leſſer ſinnes alſo, which are not committed againſt God, it is needfull that Confeſsion be made, and this alſo he often commandeth to be, l. 1. Ep. 3 &c. That Satisfaction alſo was accuſtomed to be impoſed according to the offence, it appeareth Ser. 5. de lapſis. And wheras M. Morton affirmeth againſt this Confeſsion of the Centuriſtes, that (16) *Cyprian mentioneth not ſinnes of thought*; this ſheweth M. Morton to be either very ignorant, or very falſe: for if he but read *Ser. 5. de lapſis*, he ſhall tynd him ſay, *But becauſe they haue but thought herof, let them confeſſe this ſorrowfully and ſimply to the Prieſtes of God &c. They diſburden their mindes, they ſeeke for wholſome cure, though but for litle and ſmall woundes &c. I beſeech you Brethren that euery one Confeſſe his ſinne &c. whiles ſatisfaction and remiſsion, made by the Prieſts, is gratefull with our Lord.* M. Morton if he pleaſe, may here ſee that S. Cyprian mentioneth euen ſinnes in thought: & though he had not, what would this diminiſh from the forſaid Confeſsion, made by the Centuriſtes of S. Cyprians cleereſt doctrine for Confeſsion.

(16) *Appeale l. 2. c. 14. p. 234.*

Now as Concerning Pennance & Satisfaction, wheras the 4. Carthage Councell decreed, that (17) *He who in his ſickneſs deſired Pennance &c. ſhould be reconciled by Impoſition of handes &c. If he recouered &c. he ſhould be ſubiect to the appointed lawes of Pennance, as long as the Prieſt who gaue him Pennance ſhall thinke good*: this Canon is confeſſed by (18) Oſiander, and approued.

(17) *Cap. 76. 78.*

(18) *Cent. 5. l. 2. c. 2. p. 15.*

The great Pennance and corporall Auſterities vſed in ancient tymes, is alſo acknowledged, and diſliked by the Centuriſtes, who heerin reproue (19) the Fathers of the fourth age, and the other ages precedent. Caluin houldeth (20) *Inexcuſable the immoderate Auſterity of the Ancient Fathers &c.* And, (21) *I am not ignorant*, ſayth Chemnitius, *that the Ancient do ſometymes commend that Canonicall diſcipline ouer largely and with ouer great wordes.* Wherof alſo ſaith Melanchton, (22) *All the Nicene Councell being ouercome with the conſent of the multitude and tyme, approued the Canons of Pennance.* Whitaker ſaith

(19) *Cent. 4. Col. 294 and ſee Col. 131.*

(20) *Inſt. l. 4. c. 12. n. 8. & l. 3. c. 4. ſect. 38.*

(21) *Exam. part. 2. p. 68.*

(22) *Lib. de aliquot. fol. 11.*

plainly, that, (23) *The Fathers thought by their externall Discipline to pay the paines due for sinne, and to satisfy Gods Iustice.* And that, (24) *Not Cyprian only wrote some things concerning Pennance very incommodiously and foolishly, but almost all the most holy Fathers at that tyme were in that Error &c.* So confessed are the Fathers for the Sacrament of Pennance.

(23) Cont. Camp. rat. 5. p. 78.
(24) Ibid.

SECT. IV.

That Protestant writers do teach that Priestes haue authority to retayne, or to forgiue sinnes: and that Confession of sinnes in particular is to be made to Priests: And that Pennance is truly a Sacrament.

(1) Disp. Theol. & c. disp. 13. art. 12. p. 195.
(2) Theolog. Christiana Scripturæ, Patrum &c. c. de Bap. p. 491.
(3) De præpar. ad Mortem.
(4) Antichristus siue Progn. post. fin. Mund. p. 140. 141.
(5) Ibid.
(6) Heilbrunerus l. Schwenckfeldio-Caluinismus. p. 55. Lobech. Disp. Theol. p. 295. 302. Alsbamerus in Concil. loc. Script. pag. m. 94. fol. 218.

THough the practise of Pennance be litle pleasing to Prot. yet they spare not to preach and teach the great necessity euen of the Sacrament of Pennance and Confession. Lobechius Doctour and Professour in the Vniuersity of Rostocke, writeth thus confidently heerof, (1) *We defend out of the Scriptures Absolution and Priuate Confession against the Caluinistes.* And another saith, (2) *There be some who take away auricular Confession, as not commanded in the Scripture, but nenertheles all Godly men, do with Great Luther so greatly magnify it, that they had rather loose certaine millions of worlds, and whatsoeuer, then to take this from the Ministery, which they neither may nor will want.*

Luther giueth this wholsome counsaile, (3) *A man being at the point of death, let him call the Priest vnto him, when he may confesse all his sinnes. If the Priest absolue me, I rest with his Absolution, as the words of God, and vpon this I dye: for thou ought as firmely to beliue the Absolution of the Priest, as if God should send vnto thee a speciall Angell, or Apostle, yea as if Christ himselfe shall absolue.*

In like manner other Prot. affirme, (4) *Confession and Priuate Absolution to be necessary.* In reguard wherof others of their Brethren name them (5) *Nostri noui Papæ, Our new Popes.* But some proceed so far herin, that they reproue (6) *the Caluinistes for contemning priuate Absolution, and beliuing that the Minister of the Church cannot forgiue sinnes, but only God.*

Caluin

Caluin expounding thoſe words of the Apoſtle, (7) *We are Legates for Chriſt*, acknowledgeth, that the (8) *Embaſſage of Reconciliation is left with the Miniſters of the Church.* And a litle before, *when Chriſt gaue to his Apoſtles command and power of forgiuing ſinnes, he did not only meane, that they ſhould looſe thoſe from ſinnes, who ſhould be conuerted from Impiety to the faith of Chriſt; but rather that they ſhould continually vſe this function among the faithfull.* And more particularly concerning Confeſſion he ſayth, (9) *I thinke that old obſeruation whereof Cyprian maketh mention, to haue bene holy and profitable to the Church, and I ſhould deſire, that it were at this day reſtored. This later though I dare not diſproue it, or at leaſt more ſharply impugne, yet I thinke it leſſe neceſſary.* And hauing ſaid, and confirmed from the Teſtimony of S. Iames, that, (10) *The Scripture doth approue that forme of priuate Confeſſion*, that (11) *we confeſſe our ſinnes one to another*, he giueth this his Interpretation therof: *Although Iames by naming none into whoſe boſome we ſhould diſburden our ſelues, permitteth vs free choice to confeſſe to him who of the flocke of the Church ſeemeth moſt fit; yet becauſe Paſtours for the moſt part, are to be thought more fit then others, they are therfore chiefly to be choſen by vs.* And a litle after, *Therfore let euery one of the faithfull remember, that it is his duty, if he be ſo priuatly vexed and afflicted with the feeling of his ſinnes, that he cannot free himſelfe, but by the help of another, not to neglect the remedy which is offered him by our Lord, to wit, that for his help he vſe priuate Confeſſion with his Paſtour.* Againe, (12) *That the ſheep preſent themſelues to the Paſtour ſo often as they communicate, I am ſo farre from gaynſaying, that I greatly wish it were euery where obſerued.* As alſo, (13) *Thou wilt ſay, what then, is not euery ſinne to be confeſſed? Then no Confeſſion is acceptable to God, but that which is included in theſe words, Peccator ſum, I am a ſinner? But truly we are rather to vſe diligence, that as much as is in vs, we powre out our whole hart before the Lord; Neyther let vs only in one word confeſſe our ſelues to be ſinners, but as ſuch, let vs truly and from our hart acknowledge our ſelues. Let vs remember withall our thoughts, how great and diuerſe are the ſpots of ſinnes; not only that we are vncleane, but of what ſort, how great, and in how many parts our impurity is; not only that we are debtors but with how great debts we are burdened, and by how many names we are bound; not only*

(7) 2. Cor. 5. 20.
(8) Inſt. l. 4. c. 1. §. 22.
(9) Inſtit. l. 4. c. 19. §. 14.
(10) Inſt. l. 3. c. 4. §. 12.
(11) Iac. 5. 16.
(12) §. 13.
(13) Inſt. l. 3. c. 4. §. 17. 18.

that we are woũded, but with how many & deadly woũds we are hurt. From theſe premiſſes taken from Caluin, I would demand whether this priuate Confeſſion, which he affirmeth to be a Remedy offered by the Lord, and which he would haue the faythfull to vſe with their Paſtour, when they are afflicted with their ſinnes, or when they are to communicate; whether I ſay this Priuate Confeſſion be a matter of Neceſſity & precept, or only of Coũſaile? This latter they cannot ſay, ſeeing according to Proteſtants, all things we are to do are commanded, and nothing left free, or only of Counſaile: if they ſay the firſt, then Priuate Confeſſion is of neceſſity and Command, which is the point by me intended, & which Prot. ſinnefully tranſgreſſe, not vſing priuate Confeſſion to lawfull Paſtours.

(14) C. 19. 18. Caluin alſo expounding thoſe words of the Acts (14) *Many of them that beleiued, came confeſsing and declaring their deeds,*

(15) Calu. in Act. 18. 19. ſayth, (15) *They teſtifyed indeed that they were ſeriouſly moued with the feare of God, who of their owne accord confeſſed the ſinnes of their former lyfe, leaſt by their diſsimulation they ſhould inwardly nourish the Anger of God.* And a litle after: *Therefore this voluntary Confeſsion was witneſſe of Pennance and feare: for no man but much touched with the feeling of Gods Iudgement, will ſubiect himſelfe to the reproaches and ignominy of men, and will willingly vndergoe the Iudgement in Earth, that he may be looſed in heauen from the guilt.* Agreably alſo heerto ſaith Beza, (16) *Being terrified with the feare of Gods Iudgement, they profeſſed their faults, and deteſted them.* So cleere it is from the Scriptures, euen by the Expoſition of Proteſtants, that the firſt Chriſtians confeſſed their ſinnes to S. Paul, and the other Apoſtles.

(16) Aunot. maior. in Act. 19. 18.

(17) In Schluſſelb. Theo. Caluin. l. 2. f. 147.

(18) Harm. of Confeſſ. p. 231.

(19) Ib. p. 357. 358.

(20) Ib. p. 448.

(21) L. 1. Epiſt. Ep. Weſtphal. 10. p. 314.

Melanchthon and Bucer at the Conference at Ratisbone did (17) *Euidently ſhew, that priuate Abſolution was to be retayned in the Church for moſt waighty cauſes.* And the like neceſſity therof is taught by the (18) Confeſſions of Saxony and (19) Bohemia: In ſo much that the Deuines of Saxony (20) *Do not admit any to the Communion, except they be firſt heard and abſolued of the Paſtours.* Whereof alſo ſayth Melanchthon (21) *Let Communion be miniſtred, but let priuate Abſolution go before, which for many cauſes is to be kept and reſtored.* But Schluſſelburge further

ther auoucheth, that (12) *It is a wicked thing to take away Priuate Absolution*: And that, *They who contemne it, do not vnderstand what is Remission of sinnes, or the power of the keyes.* Sarcerius condemneth it as an (23) *Errour to affirme, that Confession made before God doth suffice.* And that (24) *Priuate Confession being taken away, Christ gaue the keyes in vayne.*

Doctour Andrewes in his publicke (25) *Sermon* made in Court earnestly defended, that the Ecclesiasticall Minister had authority and power, not only to pronounce remission of sinnes to the Penitent, but also to conferre and giue the same. In the English *Communion Booke* deuised by Prot. after the *sicke* (26) *persons speciall Confession, if he feele his Conscience troubled*, is set downe the forme of Absolution, being the same with that which the Catholickes vse, wherein the Minister sayth to the Penitent, *Our Lord Iesus who left power to his Church to absolue all sinners &c. and by his authority cõmitted to me I absolue thee from all thy sinnes.* And the like doctrine heereof might be shewed from (17) Hierome of Prague, (28) Iohn Husse, and (29) Richard Wich.

Now, that Pennance is truly a Sacrament, Luther granteth, (30) *I am to deny* (saith he) *that there are 7. Sacraments, and only 3. are to be put for the tyme, Baptisme, Pennance, Bread.* And (31) *we willingly confesse Pennance with the vertue of the absoluing keyes to be a Sacrament: for it hath a Promise and sayth of remission of sinnes frõ Christ.* The Apology of the Augustane Cõfession auerreth that, (32) *If we call Sacraments, rytes, which haue the Commandement of God, and to which promise of Grace is added, it is easy to Iudge which are properly Sacraments.* And a little after applying the definition, it addeth, *Therefore Baptisme, the Supper of the Lord, Absolution which is the Sacrament of Pennance, are truly Sacraments, for these rytes haue the Commandement of God, and promise of Grace.* Melancthon teacheth, that (33) *Baptisme, the Lords Supper, and Absolution, which is the Sacrament of Pennance, are truly Sacraments. For these rytes haue a Commandement of God, and promise of Grace, which is proper to the New Testament.* And in another place he sayth vpon those wordes, *Amen dico vobis* (34) *Mat. 18. This place euen as the former establisheth the Sacrament of Pennance: for there is a certaine promise, whereby*

(11) Theol. Caluin. l. 2. fol. 147.
(23) Loc. Com. de Confess. fol. 289. 294.
(24) Ib. p. 289.
(25) Preached. Anno 1599.
(26) In the visit. of the sicke.
(27) Act. Mon. p. 245.
(28) Ib. p. 227. 216.
(29) Ib. p. 141.
(30) L. Capt. Babyl. init. & in Propos. cent. Louan. Anno 1545. Propos. 35.
(31) Luth. in Assert. 35. cent. Louan.
(32) Apol. Confess. Augustan. Art. 13.
(33) Loc. com. Anno 1545. ca. de num. & vsu Sacram. init. Extat. Tom. 2. operum Edit. Wittemb. 1562.
(34) In Cap. 18. Matth.

whereby is promiſed ſinne to be forgiuen, the key abſoluing. And the ſame is acknowledged by the (35) Centuriſtes.

(35) Cent. 1. l. 2. c. 4. Col. 53.

Huſſe affirmeth that, (36) *There are three parts of perfect Pennance, to wit, Contrition, Confeſſion and Satisfaction.* Againe (37) *The ſecond part of Pennance is Confeſſion, which is a recounting of ſinnes before God and the Prieſt, which ought to be playne and entyre: Plaine, that the Prieſt may vnderſtand: entyre, leſt he that confeſſeth wittingly hyde any ſinne, for he that hydeth his ſinnes ſhall not be directed &c.* Rokzana ſayth, (38) *The ſecond part of Pennance is Confeſſion it ſelfe, which is made to Prieſtes, and vnles this Confeſſion ſhould haue Efficacy, is ſhould ſeeme that Chriſt had ſuperfluouſly giuen the power of the Keyes to the Apoſtles and Prieſts ſucceeding.* And the ſame is taught by the (39) Waldenſes.

(36) Tract. de Pœnit.

(37) Ibid.

(38) De Sacram. c. 27.

(39) In Confeſſ. fidei exhibita Anno 1508.

Perkins ſpeaking of Confeſſion granteth, that the want thereof, (40) *Is a great fault in our Churches.* A ſpeach moſt true, ſeeing the want thereof cauſeth amongſt all Proteſtants a generall inūdation of enormous ſinnes. But by the premiſes all men may ſee that all ſorts of Proteſtants, Huſſites, Lutheranes & Caluiniſtes, do acknowledge and teach the Sacrament of Pennance, and Confeſſion of ſinnes.

(40) Vol. 3. p. 448.

SECT. V.

Obiections from Scripture againſt the power giuen by Chriſt to Prieſts for the remitting of ſinnes, anſwered.

IT is ordinarily obiected by Proteſtantes now, as formerly it was by the Scribes againſt Chriſt, ſaying (1) *Who can forgiue ſinnes but only God?* But in beſt anſwere herto S. Mathew reporteth Chriſt himſelfe to ſay: (2) *That you may know that the Sonne of Man hath power in Earth to forgiue ſinnes, then ſaid he to the ſicke of the palſey; Aryſe, take vp thy bed, and goe into thy houſe. And he aroſe, and went into his houſe. And the multitudes ſeeing it &c. glorifyed God that gaue ſuch power to men:* Yet in more Explanation herof, it is to be obſerued, that ſundry things are attributed to God as proper to him, which are neuertheles in a ſecondary reſpect communicated alſo to creatures; ſo it

(1) Mar. 2. 7. Iſa. 43. 25. & 44. 22. Ier. 31. 34.

(2) Mat. 9. 6. Mar. 2. 10.

is

is ſaid, (3) *None is good but only God*; Yet our Sauiour as being Man was good, and ſo alſo are (4) others. God (5) only doth miracles, and yet alſo Moyſes (6) did Miracles, and ſo likewiſe are (7) others ſaid to do them; the very power (8) of healing euery ſicknes, and caſting forth of vncleane Spirites being in expreſſe termes giuen to his twelue Diſciples, and therby ſo truly in them, that S. Peter ſaid to the lame man, (9) *That which I haue, the ſame I giue to thee, In the name of Ieſus Chriſt of Nazareth, Aryſe and walke &c. And he went walking and leaping, and prayſing God.* In like ſort it is ſayd, that, (10) *God only knoweth the harts of men*, yet (11) others alſo knew the ſecrets of the hart. Laſtly, D. Whiteguift doth proue, & explaine, how that (12) *Names proper to God may in ſome reſpect be attributed to others*, for as he teacheth, *they belong to God properly, and to man but in reſpect he is the Miniſter of God*, and ſo God only by his proper power and authority forgiueth ſinnes, and yet alſo men do actually and truly, yet miniſterially forgiue ſinnes, for to them is (13) giuen *The Miniſtery of Reconciliation*. This Obiection is of ſo ſmall force, that it is anſwered according to the Premiſſes by the Proteſtant (14) Lobechius, who repeating the ſame ſayth, *Only God can abſolue from ſinne, but ſo, that he doth this ſometymes immediatly* (or by himſelfe) *& ſometymes medialy, by his Miniſters, pardoning our faults &c. The Caluiniſts therefore erre, who &c. take away that efficacy from the Abſolution of the Miniſter of the word &c. contending that the Miniſter doth abſolue only as a Meſſenger.* And the like is anſwered by Althamerus and Hailbrunerus: and Sarcerius auoucheth that (15) *It is falſe, that Confeſsion which is made to God, doth take away priuate Confeſsion.* So impertinent and weake is this ſo often repeated Obiection, being cleered by other moſt plaine Scriptures, and reiected by Proteſtant writers.

(3) *Luc.* 18. 19. *Mat.* 19. 16.
(4) *Luc.* 6. 45. *Mat.* 7. 18.
(5) *Pſ.* 72. 18. & 136. 4.
(6) *Deut.* 34. 11 12.
(7) *Eccl.* 48. 4. 14 *Io.* 14. 12. *Mat.* 7. 22.
(8) *Mat.* 10. 1.
(9) *Act.* 3. 6.
(10) 3. *Reg.* 8. 39.
(11) 4. *Reg.* 5. 26.
(12) Defence, P. 300.
(13) 2. *Cor.* 5. 18.
(14) *Diſp. Theol. p.* 301. *Althamer. in Conciliat. locor. &c. loc.* 194. *fol.* 218. *Hailbr. in Suenckfeldio-Caluin. p.* 35. 1
(15) *Loc. com. de Confeſſ. fol.* 389.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXV.

The true State of the Queſtion, concerning puniſhment to be ſuffered after Remiſſion of the fault.

Whether the fault of Sinne, being pardoned by the Sacrament of Pennance, the puniſhment due to ſinne, is alſo alwayes pardoned therewith: or whether the ſayd puniſhment is not afterwards to be payd, or ſatisfyed by Prayer, Faſting, and Almes, and the paines in Purgatory?

SECT. I.

Catholike Doctrine.

THE liberty of the new Ghoſpell extending it ſelfe ſo farre as to the taking away of all puniſhment after the forgiuenes of the fault: in condemnation thereof the Catholicke Church teacheth, that *In the* (1) *Pennance of a Chriſtian, there is not only contayned ceſſation from ſinnes, and deteſtation of them &c. but alſo Sacramentall Confeſſion &c. and Priefily Abſolution; as alſo Satisfaction by Faſting, Almes, Prayer, and other pious Exerciſes of ſpirituall lyfe, not for the Eternall payne which togeather*

(1) Conc. Trid. Seſſ. 6. Cap. 14.

gether with the fault is remitted by the Sacrament, or the desire thereof, but for the temporall punishment, which as the Scriptures teach, is not alwaies wholly forgiuen them, as it is in Baptisme &c. And therfore the further Decreeth, that, (2) *If any shall say, that after the Grace of Iustification receiued, the fault and guilt of eternall punishment is so remitted to euery Penitent sinner, that no guilt of temporall punishment remayneth to be paid either in this world, or in the next in Purgatory before he can come to Heauen, Anathema.* (2) Sess. 6. Can. 30.

In the Councell Senonense it is decreed, that, (3) *The fault by Pennance taken away, there doth often remayne the guilt of temporall punishment, as certaine relickes of sinnes remayning, which are to be purged by fruites worthy of Pennance; so that the iniquity and fault of sinne forgiuen, the sinner yet remayneth subiect to temporall punishment.* (3) Decret. 12.

Agreably to these Councels, (4) Catholickes with one consent teach, that after the remission of the fault, there often remaineth the guilt of temporall punishment to be paid: And that the same may be satisfyed by the good works of Prayer, Fasting, Almes, and the like. (4) Beller. de Purgat. l. 4. c. 2. 3. Rhem. Tess. in Hebr. 12. 6.

Points Disputable.

Some (5) teach that the temporall punishment so remayning is the selfesame in kind with that which should haue bene paid in hell, and so is to be paid in Purgatory, if it be not redeemed in this life. (6) Others thinke it a paine of a different kind, which also may be paid in this life, according to the order prescribed, and appointed by Gods Prouidence. (5) Tapperus in 1. 6. Lohan. (6) See Valens. Tom. 2. Disp. 6. Quæst. 17. Punct. 5.

Some (7) thinke, that satisfaction done by a man that is not in state of grace, if the satisfaction be such as leaueth any effect behind it, as Almes, Fasting, and the like, that then it beginneth to be of force, when a man returneth to the grace of God. Others (8) thinke, that when satisfaction is imposed by a Priest by vertue of the keies, that then it reuiueth, when the Penitent recouereth grace. But (9) others more probably teach, that, Satisfaction done in the state of sinne, doth neuer after reuiue, or be of force, whether the satisfa- (7) Paludan. 4 Dist. 15 q. 1 Conc. 7. Conclud. Dist. Syluester verbo, Satisfactio. (8) Caiet. q. 2. de satisfact. (9) Adrian in 4. q. 1. de

satisfact. Scotus Dist. 19. q. 1. art. 5.

(10) S. Tho. Durand Paludan. in 4. Dist. 15.

(11) Adrian tract. de Pœnit. Gaiet. q. 1. de satisfact.

(12) Scotus, Gabriel.

(13) S. Thom. and most others.

(14) In Assert. Art. 5.

(15) Apol. Confess. Augustl. Art. de Confess. & Satisfact.

(16) Lib. 4. Sentent. distinct. 16.

(17) Lib. 50. homil. ho. 50. c. 15.

(18) In Instit. l. 3. c. 4.

(19) In loc. com. tit de satisfact.

tisfaction be imposed by a Priest, or leaue any effect behynd it.

Some (10) teach, that Satisfaction is not duly made by workes otherwise due: But (11) others not improbably thinke the contrary. Some (12) thinke, that the Penitent is not bound vnder sinne to accept the Pennance imposed by the Priest: but the common (13) opinion is to the contrary.

Protestants Vntruthes.

Protestants pretend that our Catholicke Doctrine of Satisfaction is neither taught by the Scriptures, nor the Ancient Fathers. Luther saith, (14) *Wherfore I said true, that this Arbitrary Satisfaction is neither found in Scriptures or Fathers &c.* Melancthon following Luther affirmeth, (15) *That all this of Satisfaction is false, and lately faigned without authority of Scripture, and Ancient Ecclesiasticall writers: And not Longobarde doth speake thus of Satisfaction &c.* But that both Scriptures and Fathers do teach our Doctrine of Satisfaction, the two next Sections will abundantly proue. And as for Longobarde, Melancthon doth so fowly belye him, as that he hauing proued from Scriptures and Fathers Satisfaction, he concludeth thus, (16) *To do Pennance it sufficeth not, to amend our manners, and to depart from euill deeds, vnles for these which are done, God be satisfyed by the sorrow of Pennance, by the groanes of humility, by the Sacrifice of a contrite hart, Almes working therwith.* And this saying Longobard tooke from (17) S. Austine: so that we haue both Longobard and S. Austine for Satisfaction to God. And by this may also Caluin be confuted, who affirmeth, that, (18) *What Catholicke writers bring from the Fathers for Satisfaction, is for the most part Canons, out of the absurd fooleries of Monkes.* Melancthon also auoucheth that Catholickes, (19) *do obscure the Ghospell, because they faigne eternall Death to be abolished by our Compensation: yea the vnlearned do easily transferre Satisfactions also to the Remission of the fault.* But this is so false, that this forgetfull lyar doth confute it himselfe in the same place saying, *The Monkes* (meaning Catholicke

licke writers) *here deſyne Satisfaction to be workes not due, wherwith they will haue the paines of Purgatory to be redeemed, or certainly ſome other temporall punishments, for ſo they teach: God ſeeing he is mercifull doth remit the fault: but ſeeing he is Iuſt and a Reuenger, doth change the paine Eternall, into the temporall of Purgatory: Then they adde, part of theſe punishments to be remitted by the Power of the keyes; Part to be redeemed with Satisfactions.* So that according to our Doctrine, Eternall puniſhment is remitted by Chriſtes mercy and merits, and the temporall, by our Satisfactions, which alſo haue their vertue and value by the Grace of Chriſt, and his mercy and merites.

Proteſtant Doctrine.

The Proteſtant Church is in ſo great diſlike of Satisfaction and doing of Pennance, as that the very name therof is hatefull vnto them. Luther ſaith, (20) *I do much hate, and would haue the word Satisfaction taken away, which not only is not found in the Scriptures, but hath a daungerous ſenſe, as though man could ſatisfy God for any ſinne, when he forgiueth all gratis.* The Papiſtes, ſaith (21) Caluin, *aſsigne the third place of ſatisfaction in Pennance, wherof whatſoeuer they bable may in one word be ouerthrowne. They ſay, it ſufficeth not a Penitent man to abſtaine from ſinnes paſt, vnles he ſatisfy God for them which are committed: and that there are many helpes wherby thou mayeſt redeeme ſinnes, as teares, faſting, workes of Charity &c. To ſuch lyes, I oppoſe the free remiſsion of ſinnes, then which nothing is preached more cleere in the Scriptures.*

(20) *In aſſert. art. 5.*

(21) *In Hit. l. 3. c. 4. §. 25.*

Beza, (22) *The opinion of the Sophiſters thinking ſinne to be forgiuen, the paine reſerued, is not only falſe, but idle and foolish.* And the ſame is taught by many other Proteſtantes.

(22) *In Mat. 6. 12.*

Proteſtant Errours.

Bullinger, (23) *What had Chriſt beſtowed vpon vs, if (temporall) punishment ſhould be yet exacted for our ſinnes?* as though Remiſsion of the fault, & of the eternall puniſhment were not great benefites beſtowed by Chriſt.

(23) *De Iuſtif. ſerm. 6. fol. 17.*

SECT. II.

It is proued by Scriptures, that temporall punishment often remayneth to be paid after the fault is remitted: And that the said Punishment may be taken away by the good workes of Prayer, Fasting, Almes, and the lyke.

THE Scriptures do afford vs seuerall Examples, where death it selfe hath bene inflicted vpon sinners for punishment of their sinnes, the fault being pardoned: so to Adam God said, (1) *Because thou &c. hast eaten of the tree whereof I commanded thee that thou shouldest not eate, cursed is the Earth in thy worke; with much toyling shalt thou eate thereof all the dayes of thy life &c. In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eate thy bread, till thou returne to earth*: wherof saith S. Paul, (2) *As by one man sinne entred into this world, and by sinne death, and so vnto all men death did passe, in which all sinned.* Here Prot. do not deny that *Death* is a Punishment of originall Sinne, and yet many dye to whom Originall Sinne is forgiuen; wherfore punishment remaineth after the fault is remitted. Some reply, that *death* is inflicted not for punishment, but for the Exercise of vertue. But this is cleerly false in Infantes, that dye presently after Baptisme, to whom Originall sinne is forgiuen, and yet by reason of their Infancy, they cannot practise any vertues, and yet in punishment of sinne they are taken away before they come to yeares of Discretion. And not only *death*, but also sicknes and paines Children often endure, which are also punishmentes of Originall sinne, which can nothing profit them to preuent sinnes to come, or for the Exercise of vertue. When the Children of Israel had sinned, and Moyses prayed for them, wherupon our Lord said, (3) *I haue forgiuen it according to thy word*; yet he addeth withall their temporall Punishment, saying, *But yet all the men that &c. haue tempted me &c. neither haue obeyed my voyce, they shall not see the land for the which I sware to their Fathers*: but (4) *your Carcasses shall*

(1) Gen. 3. 17. 19.

(2) Rom. 5. 12.

(3) Numer. 14. 20. 21.

(4) Ver. 32. 33. 34.

shall lye in the wilderness: Your Children shall wander in the Desart 40. yeares, and shall beare your fornications &c. 40. yeares, you shall receyue your iniquities, and shall know my reuenge. Againe, although at their first passage out of Ægipt they committed horrible (5) Idolatry, and were pardoned (6) therof at the Instance of Moyses, their Punishment yet of the said sinne is signifyed in these words: (7) *I in the day of reuenge will visit this sinne also of theirs: our Lord therfore smote the people for the fault concerning the Calfe:* So likewise (8) Moyses and Aaron, though their incredulity was pardoned, yet were they afterwards punished with death before the Israelites entrance into the land of Promise. Here the sinnes are said to be forgiuen, and yet the Sinners after punished for the same. Though Dauid so repented him (9) of his Adultery & murder, that the Prophet said to him, *Our Lord hath taken away thy sinne:* but yet it was added, *Neuertheles because thou hast made the Enemyes of our Lord to blaspheme, for this thing the Sonne that is borne to thee, dying shall dye.* And though Dauids (10) hart stroke him after the people was numbred; and Dauid said to our Lord, *I haue sinned very much in this fact, but I pray thee Lord transferre the iniquity of thy Seruant:* yet for punishment he was to make choyce of famine, warre, or Pestilence. Add yet hereunto that the same K. Dauid expresseth this answerable concourse of Gods Iustice and mercy in pardoning, and withall punishing the sinnes of the Elect, saying, (11) *If they shall prophane my Iustices, and not keep my Commandements: I will visit their iniquities with a rod, and their sinnes with stripes; But my mercy I will not take away from him.*

(5) *Exod.* 32.
(6) *Exod.* 32. 11. 14.
(7) *Ver.* 34. 35.
(8) *Deut.* 32. 51. 52. *Num.* 20 24.
(9) 2 Reg. 12. 13. 14.
(10) 2. Reg. 24. 10. 12. 13. 1. Paral. 21. 8. 10. 12.
(11) Ps. 88. 32. 33. 34.

Caluin and Fulke answere to the forsaid Examples of Gods punishments, that, (12) *God did them not to reuenge or punish, but rather to teach and admonish vs to be more wary afterwards,* in auoyding sinne to come. But this Euasion is idle, for first in the Example of Adams punishment by Corporall death, the same was inflicted vpon him, not only for his admonition against sinne to come (for how could the Admonition against sinne to com: take place with him after his death?) but as punishment before hand appointed in penaltie of his offence after wards cõmitted, accordingly as it was said, (13)

(12) *Inst. l. 3. c. 4. sect. 31. 35. Fulke 48. Purgat. p. 42. 49*
(13) *Gen.* 2. 17.

In what day soeuer thou shalt eate of it, thou shalt dye the death.

(14) *Gen.* 3. 17. And, (14) *because thou hast eaten of the tree, cursed is the Earth for thy sake.* In the Example likewise of Dauid, his punishment is said to be, *Because thou hast made the Enemies of our Lord to blaspheme, for this thing thy sonne shall dye.* Also, the Israelites punishment was first conceiued *in* (15) *fury and anger*, and their sinne threatned to be afterwards (16) *Visited in the day of reuenge &c. for the fault concerning the Calfe which Aaron had made.* Lastly Moyses and Aaron who both dyed in Gods fauour, for their Incredulity being punished by death, and so preuented for entring the land of Promise, could not haue this Punishment for any Admonition after their death, but it was done in Iustice and Iudgment, as the Prophet expresseth saying, (17) *God thou wast propitious to them, and taking vengeance vpon all their Inuentions.*

(15) *Ex.* 32. 10. 11.

(16) *Ex.* 32. 34.

(17) *Ps.* 98. 8.

(18) 1. *Cor.* 5. 5. S. Paul speaking of the Incestuous Corinthian, (18) *appointeth to deliuer such an one to Sathan, for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saued in the day of our Lord Iesus Christ.* These wordes cannot be referred to remission of the fault, but to some temporall punishment, to be paid, the fault remitted; for not by death but by Pennance we obtaine pardon of our deadly sinnes: Also in that he further sayth, (19) *Whom you haue pardoned any thing, I also, for my selfe also that which I pardoned, if I pardoned any thing for you in the person of Christ*: these words cannot concerne the remission of the fault, seeing that was pardoned (20) before by his great sorrow; but only of the temporall punishment which was imposed in the name of Christ. This truth (21) Caluin dareth not deny, nor (22) Beza, who confesseth that the pardon of this rigour, was afterwards called *Indulgence.*

(19) 2. *Cor.* 2. 10.

(20) 2. *Cor.* 2. 7.

(21) *In* 2. *Cor.* 2.

(22) *Beda Ib.*

Now, that this punishment may be taken away by workes of Satisfaction and Pennance, it appeareth cleerly by sundry Textes of Scripture; as where it is said, (23) *Redeeme thy sinnes with Almes, and thine Iniquities with the mercies of the poore.* (24) *By mercy and truth iniquity is redeemed.* Here the word *Redeeme*, is certainly equiualent to satisfy; and Redemption doth as much belong to Iustice as Satisfaction: wherfore if it were vntrue or absurd to say, we satisfy by workes,

(23) *Dan.* 4. 24.

(24) *Prou.* 16. 6.

workes, then the like were to be ſaid of Redeeming by workes. And doubtles all Prot. would take it more hainouſly to haue men called in any ſenſe *Redeemers*, then *Satisfiers*; Wherfore ſeeing the Scriptures affirme that ſinnes are redeemed by workes, in the like ſenſe we may ſay, that they are ſatisfied by workes.

Neither will it auayle to ſay with Caluin, (25) that this Redemption was of the debt due to men, as to reſtore what he had vniuſtly taken away: for it is cleere by the text, that the chiefe ſinne for the which he was to be puniſhed, was pryde, for hauing ſaid, (26) *Is not this Babylon the great City which I haue built to be the houſe of the kingdome in the ſtrength of my power, and in the glory of my beauty?* Immediatly it followeth, *And when the word was yet in the kings mouth, a voyce came downe from heauen &c. Thy kingdome ſhall paſſe from thee, and from men they ſhall caſt thee out &c. till thou know, that the High one ruleth in the kingdome of men, and to whomſoeuer he will, he giueth it.* And ſo accordingly when he was reſtored to his ſenſes, he (27) preſently praiſed and glorifyed God. Beſides though the king ſinned in Iniuſtice towards men, yet certainly he had many other ſinnes, all which Daniel aduiſed him to redeeme with Almes, according to that elswhere, (28) *Almes deliuereth from all Sinne and from Death.* And, (29) *giue Almes, and behould all things are cleane vnto you.*

(25) *Inſtit. l. 3 c. 4. §. 30.*

(26) *Dan. 4. 27.*

(27) *Dan. 4. 31.*

(28) *Tob. 4. 11.*

(29) *Luc. 11. 41.*

This place of Daniel is ſo cleere, that Prot: for their laſt ſhift corrupt the Text, tranſlating it thus, (30) *Breake of thy ſinnes by righteouſnes*, wheras the Greeke hath moſt literally, ἐν ἐλεημοσύναις λύτρωσαι, *redeeme with Almes*: And the Chaldee, as Munſter confeſſeth, ſignifyeth rather and more principally to *redeeme*: And laſtly, that which they tranſlate *righteouſnes*, in the Scriptures ſignifyeth alſo *Almes*, as the Greeke Interpreters tranſlate it, and is moſt plaine, where our Sauiour ſaith, (31) *Beware you do not your Iuſtice before men*, which is in other Greeke Copies ἐλεημοσύνην, *almes*; Yea Beza himſelfe teacheth, that, (32) *by the name of Iuſtice with the Hebrewes, is alſo ſignifyed beneficence, or beneficialnes to the poore: and that in this place of Daniel it is ſpecially taken for Almes.*

(30) *Engl. Bib. of 1578.*

(31) *Mat. 6. 1.*

(32) *Annot. in Mat. 6. 1.*

God

God himselfe speaking of a perfect clensing from all sinne saith, (33) *Wash you, be cleane, take away the euill of your cogitations from myne eyes, ceasse to do peruersly, learne to do good, seeke iudgment, succour the oppressed, iudge for the Pupill, defend the widdow; And come and accuse me, saith our Lord, If your sinnes shalbe as scarlet, they shalbe made whyte as snow; and if they be red as vermilion, they shalbe white as wool.* Here this full remission is not graunted to those that only repent and believe, but withall they must exercise themselues in many good workes.

(33) Isa. 1. 16. 17. 18.

Lastly all such texts as teach, that the workes of the iust are meritorious of life euerlasting do confirme this truth, for if they haue that Efficacy truly and properly to merit life Eternall, it cannot be denied but that they are also Efficacious to satisfy for temporall punishment. Glory eternall being a farre greater matter then the remission of temporall punishment. But of this I shall hereafter haue occasion to speake more at large.

SECT. III.

That the Fathers do expound the Scriptures in proofe of Punishment remaining after the fault pardoned: And that the said Punishment is paid by workes of Penance.

THe forsaid Scriptures are answerably expounded by the Ancient Fathers: so *Blessed Dauid* (saith S. Cyril) (1) *forbeared not from Penance although he had heard that our Lord had transferred his sinne: but instead of Purple he vsed Sackcloth, and in place of a golden throne, the king sate vpon the Earth, and in ashes: neither did he only sit in ashes but also did eate them, euen as himselfe saith, I did eate ashes as bread: he reuenged with teares his coueting eye, saying, I will euery night wash my bed, and I will water my Couch with teares: when the Princes intreated him to eate bread, he would not be perswaded, and continued his fast, euen vntill the seauenth day.*

(1) Catech. 2. Hilar. in ps. 118.

S. Chrisostome expounding S. Paul, saith, (2) *Hearken to Paul*

(2) Ho. 42. in Math.

Paul saying, If we would iudge our selues we should not be iudged. But thou wilt say, how may I exact account and punishment of my selfe? powre out great floods of teares, afflict thy selfe with labours & watchings, remember thy sinnes of all kinds. The wounds, saith (3) Theodoret.) which are made after Baptisme, are curable; but curable, not pardon giuen by only faith, but by many teares, weeping, sorrow, fasting, prayer, and labour answerable to the greatnesse of the sinne committed. (3) Epitome diuin. Decr. c. de Pœnitentia.

S. Hierome teacheth that, (4) Peter blotted out his threefold denyall, by his threefold Confession. Aarons Sacriledge &c. his Brothers prayers corrected. Seauen dayes hunger amended Dauids &c. murder and Adultery: he lay vpon the Earth, he was rolled in Ashes, and forgetfull of his kingly power he sought light in darknes, and looking only vpon him whom he had offended, with a crying voyce he said, To thee only haue I sinned. (4) Ep. 30. ad Otem. c. 2.

But none is more full herin then S. Austine, (5) It is not sufficient to amend your manners, and to giue ouer euill deeds, vnles for those which are done God be satisfyed by the griefe of Pennance, by the groning of humility, by the Sacrifice of a Contrite hart, Almes cooperating. For blessed are the mercifull, for they shall obtaine mercy. It is not said, that yee only abstaine from sinnes, but for (6) the sinnes past pray our Lord that they may be forgiuen thee. Againe, (7) aske mercy, but attend iustice: mercy is, that he pardon a sinner, Iustice is, that he punish sinne. What then? thou seekest mercy, will thy sinne remaine vnpunished? Let Dauid answere, let those which are fallen answere, let them answere with Dauid, that they may deserue mercy as Dauid, and let them say, my sinne, O Lord, shall not be vnpunished, I haue knowne his iustice whose mercy I seeke, it shall not be vnpunished: but therfore I will not that thou punish me, because I punish my sinne. (5) Ho. vlt. inter 50. ho. c. 5. (6) Eccles. 21. 1. (7) Ad ps. 50.

With S. Austine agreeth S. Gregory saying, (8) Our Lord doth not spare the sinner, because he leaueth not the sinne without reuenge; for either the man penitent punisheth it in himselfe, or God reuenging it with man striketh &c. So Dauid after his Confession deserued to heare, Our Lord hath transferred thy sinne, and yet afflicted afterwardes with many punishmentes, and slying, he paid the guilt of fault which he had committed. God endeauoureth with temporall affliction to wype from his Elect the spots of their sinnes, which he will not reuenge in them for euer. According to S. Cyprian, (9) the (8) Mor. l. 9. c. 17. (9) Serm de opere & Eleemos.

holy Ghoſt ſpeaketh in the Scriptures and ſaith, with blood and ſuch ſinnes are purged, are thoſe ſinnes which were committed before (Baptiſme) for thoſe are purged by the Bloud and Satisfaction of Chriſt.

But the Fathers are ſo cleere for Satisfaction and Pennance, as D. Whitaker affirmeth, that they (10) *Thought by their externall Diſcipline of lyfe to pay the paines due for ſinnes, and to ſatisfy Gods Iuſtice.* And that (11) *Not Cyprian only, but almoſt all the moſt holy Fathers of that tyme were in that Errour.* The Centuriſtes ſpeaking of the third Age, relate that, (12) *Of thoſe who ſo confeſſed little ſinnes, their lyfe alſo was looked into, and iudged, whether they had done iuſt Pennance, as it appeareth in the third Booke and 16. Epiſt. of Cyprian: that alſo accuſtomed Pennance was impoſed vpon them according to their fault, is to be ſeene in him 5. Sermon de lapſis. Tertullian alſo mentioneth the ſame in his Booke de Pœnitentia.* And, (13) *Moſt of the writers of this age did ſtrongly deprave the Doctrine of Pennance.* Calvin alſo doth ſo much diſlike the Fathers Doctrine of Satisfaction, as that he writeth thus, (14) *Little do thoſe thinges moue me, which euery where occurre in the writings of the Ancient concerning Satisfaction: I ſee ſome of them, I will ſpeake ſimply, almoſt all whoſe Bookes are extant, either to haue erred in this, or to haue ſpoken ouer ſharply and ſeuerely.* So Confeſſed it is, that the Ancient Fathers taught our Doctrine of Satisfaction and Pennance.

(10) Cont. Camp. rat. 5. p. 78.
(11) Ibid. rat. 3. p. 78.
(12) Cent. 3. Col. 117.
(13) Ibid. Col. 81.
(14) Inſt. l. 3. c. 4. §. 38. Chemnit. in Exam. part. 2. p. 1082. & p. 306.

SECT. IV.

That Proteſtantes do agree with Catholickes, in teaching that Punishment often remayneth to be paid for ſinne, the fault being remitted: and that the ſame punishment may be ſatisfyed by good workes.

THE great Deuine of Scotland Iohn Knox cõfeſſeth, & collecteth from the forſaid Scriptures, that the ſinners of ſuch as are Elect, and therfore freed from Hell punishment, are neuertheles yet temporally puniſhed, and that not for Admonition only againſt ſinne to come, but in Gods Iuſtice and hatred to the ſaid ſinnes already paſt: to this end he ſaith,

faith, (1) *We proteſt and acknowledge, that ſinne is ſo odious to God, that he never ſuffereth the ſame vnpunished, in any of his Elect Children.* And, (2) *we preach, wryte and maintayne, that ſinne was ſo odious before God, that his Iuſtice could do no other, but inflict vpon Adam and his Poſterity the penalty of Corporall Death, the punishments and plagues, which daily do apprehend Gods Children: that vpon Dauid he did execute his iuſt Iudgement, which in theſe wordes he pronounced, Now therfore the ſword ſhall never depart from thy houſe*; with ſundry other Scriptures by him alleadged to the ſame effect. And yet it is certaine, that the fault of Adam, and Dauids ſinnes were forgiuen them.

(1) Answ. againſt the Aduerſaries of Gods Predeſt. p. 235.
(2) Ib. p. 216.
(3) In ſymbolum Apoſt. p. 8.
(4) Alta Colleq. Regenſpurg. p. 112.
(5) Ib. p. 81.
(6) Ib. p. 230.
(7) Ib. p. 178. And ſee Melanct. loc. com. de bonis oper. p. 238. in Concil. Theol. p. 347. And loc. com. de Satisfac. p. 241.
(8) Loc. com. Tom. de Punit. fol. 276.
(9) Harm. of Confeſſ. p. 219.
(10) Ib. p. 224.
(*) Harm. of Confeſſ. p. 236.
(11) Com. placin Eng. part 3. c. 4. p. 124.
(12) Harm. of

Gaſpar Olevianus affirmeth that, (3) *God is ſo iuſt, and ſinne ſo great an euill, that he doth not then approue ſinnes when he hath pardoned them, and that he may ſhow this, he alſo after the remiſſion in thoſe that are conuerted, punisheth them with moſt sharpe whippes, as in Dauid &c.* Melanchon (4) *in the name of all the Proteſtantes*, (5) *who ſtood to the Confeſſion of Auſpurg*, teacheth that, (6) *The offences of the converted perſons are punished with certaine peculiar paines, as was Dauids Adultery: and that theſe paines are* (7) *mitigated through good workes.*

Sarcerius teacheth not only (8) *temporall paines*, but alſo *the mitigation of them* by good workes. And here withall agreeth the Confeſſion of Auſpurg teaching that, (9) *Sinnes are punished euen by Temporall punishment in this lyfe, as Dauid, Manaſſes, and many others were punished: and we teach that theſe punishmentes may be mitigated by good workes, and the whole practiſe of Repentance, as Paul declareth, If we would Iudge our ſelues, we ſhould not be Iudged of the Lord. And repentance deſerued (that is obtained) that God ſhould alter his purpoſe touching the Deſtruction of Ninive.* And, (10) *We are of that mynd, that the calamities of this lyfe may be aſſwaged by good workes, as Eſay teacheth, Chap. 58. Breake thy bread vnto the hungry, and the Lord ſhall giue thee reſt continually.*

The Confeſſion of Saxony doth diſtinguiſh betwene (*) eternall Punishment, and the Punishment of this lyfe: affirming further that, *The temporall punishmentes are mitigated euen for the very Conuerſions ſake.* Of the like Iudgment alſo is Peter (11) Martyr. And the Confeſſion of Wittemberg doth vpon this ground acknowledge, (12) *that the Saintes haue the in*

Confeſſ. p. 508.

their Purgatory fyre in this lyfe, as the Examples of Dauid, Ezechias, Ionas and others do witneſſe. Piſcator, (13) Bullinger, and Hiperius do all of them reach, and approue the diſtinction of *Malum culpæ, & malum pœnæ*. Foxe acknowledgeth, (14) *temporall punishment for ſinne*. Cartwright affirmeth that, (15) *The Lord remitting the fault to his Children vpon their repentance, hath notwithſtanding kept them in ſharpe diſcipline for their faults.* And in the Annotations of the Engliſh Bible of 1576. *in Exodus* 32. 34. where the Iſraelites Idolatry is mentioned, it is ſaid, *This declareth how grieuous a ſinne Idolatry is, ſeeing that at Moyſes prayer God would not fully remit it.* Caluin aduiſeth that, (16) *So often as we are afflicted, we preſently remember our life paſt, ſo without doubt we ſhall fynd, that we haue committed that, which deſerued this Correction.* So plentifull are our Proteſtantes for temporall punishment, and Satisfaction after the Remiſſion of the fault.

(13) *Volumen Theſ. Theol. p. 102. ſect. 111. Bulling. in Decad. p 493. Hiperius Meth. Theol. p. 1. p. 415.*

(14) *In Apoc. in c. 14. p. 514.*

(15) *2. Reply ag. Whitgi. fol. 172.*

(16) *Inſtit. l. 3. c. 8. §. 6.*

SECT. V.

Obiections from Scripture, to proue that the Punishment is alwaies remitted with the fault, are anſwered.

LVther (1) obiecteth that, (2) *The wickednes of the wicked ſhall not hurt him in what day ſoeuer he returneth from his wickedneſſe.* Anſwere. This is ſpoken of eternall punishment, which is taken away by his Conuerſion: yea the Prophet expoundeth what it is to hurt, or not to hurt, when he often ſaith, *When the Iuſt turneth from his Iuſtice and committeth iniquity, he ſhall euen dye therby: But if the wicked turne from his wickedneſſe &c. he ſhall liue therby*, which is plainly vnderſtood of life and death euerlaſting. And it is cleere, it cannot be vnderſtood of temporall punishment, ſeeing Dauid and many others after their Conuerſion did ſuffer the ſame.

(1) *Serm. de Indulgentijs.*

(2) *Ezech. 33. 12.*

Caluin (3) obiecteth thoſe wordes in Eſay, (4) *Though your ſinnes were as Crimſon, they ſhalbe made whyte as ſnow, though they were red like ſcarlet, they ſhalbe as wool.* Anſw. This was grãted with this condition, (5) *Waſh you, make you cleane, take away*

(3) *Inſtit. l. 3. c. 4.*

(4) *C. 1. 18.*

(5) *Ver. 16. 17.*

away the euill of your workes from before myne eies, ceaſe to do euill, learne to do well, ſeeke Iudgment, relieue the oppreſſed, Iudge the Fatherles, defend the widow, and come and argue me, ſaith our Lord, if your ſinnes were as Crimſon &c. Wherfore this rather proueth the neceſſity of good workes for the Satisfaction of the Puniſhment due vnto ſinne.

Luther (6) alſo vrgeth, that Chriſt abſoluing the Adultreſſe woman, ſaid, (7) *Goe and ſinne no more*, not requiring any other Satisfaction of her, but that ſhe ſhould liue better after. Anſwere. It doth not appeare by the Text, that Chriſt abſolued her from her ſinnes, but only freed her from the puniſhment of ſtoning: for he only ſaid, *Neither will I condemne thee, goe and ſinne no more:* as if he had ſaid, Neither will I condemne thee to be ſtoned, but take heed leſt by ſinning thou fall into the ſame daunger.

(6) *Lib. de Captiuit. Babyl.*

(7) *Ioan. 8. 11.*

Secondly, if Chriſt did abſolue her from ſinne, who knoweth, that he did not ſee her Contrition to be ſuch, as that further Satisfaction was not needfull: as we may eaſily thinke of S. Mary Magdalens caſe. Laſtly Chriſt being Lord he might if he pleaſed abſolue both from fault and puniſhment, whereas Prieſts his ſeruants muſt impoſe puniſhment according to the lawes giuen vnto them.

CHAP. XXVI.

The true State of the Queſtion, concerning Indulgences.

Whether the Church of Chriſt hath Authority to graunt Indulgences or Pardons for the temporall punishment due to Sinnne, the fault being formerly pardoned by the Sacrament of Pennance.

SECT. I.

Catholike Doctrine.

PROTESTANTS denying any punishment to remayne the fault being pardoned, do conſequently affirme all Indulgences to be ſuperfluous: as alſo that the Church hath no authority to grant them: But in Confutation heerof the Church hath Decreed, that, (1) *Seeing the power of giuing Indulgences is granted by Chriſt to the Church; and this power giuen her by God she hath vſed in moſt Ancient tymes; The Sacred Synod teacheth and commandeth that the vſe of Indulgences moſt profitable to Chriſtian people, and approued by the authority of holy Councels, be euer kept in the Church: And it accurſeth them who either affirme, that they are vnprofitable, or deny that in the Church there*

(1) Concil. Trid. Seſſ. 25. Decret. de Indulgentijs.

there is power to grant them. Yet in the granting of them, it desireth moderation to be vsed according to the Ancient and allowed Customs in the Church; lest by ouermuch facility Ecclesiasticall Discipline be weakened. And desiring that the abuses which haue crept in them, and by occasion whereof this worthy name of Indulgences by heretikes is blasphemed, may be amended and corrected; by this present Decree it generally decreeth, that all wicked gaines for the obtayning of them, from whence much cause of abuses in Christian people hath flowed, be vtterly abolished. And the rest which haue come by superstition, ignorance, irreuerence, or otherwise howsoeuer. seeing for the manifold corruptions of the places and Prouinces where these are committed, they fitly cannot be particularly prohibited, it commandeth all Bishops that euery one diligently gather the abuses of his Church, and that he make them knowne in the first Prouinciall Councell: that being tryed also by the iudgment of the other Bishops, they may forthwith be made known to the B. of Rome, by whose authority and wisdome that may be ordained, which wilbe expedient for the vniuersall Church: that so the benefite of holy Indulgences may piously, godly, & purely be bestowed vpon all the faythfull.

It was ordayned in the Councell of Arles: (2) Of those who haue transgressed in persecution, if they haue voluntarily denyed their fayth, the Nicene Councell hath Decreed this of them, that they shall spend 5. yeares among the Catechumens, and 2. amongst those that do Communicate &c. yet it shalbe in the power and liberty of the Bishop, that if he see them bewayle their errour from their hart, & do Pennance, by Ecclesiastical sauour he may receyue them to Communion. In the fourth Laterane Councel it is graunted, that, (3) Catholikes &c. who shall prepare themselues for the banishment of Heretickes, shall enioy that Indulgence &c. which is granted to them that go to the ayde of the holy land, which is a Plenary. And it is euident, that Indulgences haue bene actually giuen by seuerall Generall (4) Councels. And (5) Catholickes now believe that to remit the temporall Punishment or chastisement due to sinners after the offence it selfe and the guilt therof be forgiuen of God, is an Indulgence or Pardon: And that God hath giuen to the Pastours of the Church power and authority to giue the same.

(2) Conc. 2. Arelat. cap 10.

(3) Conc. 4. Lateran. Cap. 3.

(4) Conc. Clarmont. Vita S. Anton. 2. part. Hist. tit. 18. c. 2. Conc. Lateran. Constitution. 10. Trident.

(5) Bellar. de Indulg. l. 1. c. 1. & c. Rhem. Test. in 2. Cor. 2. 10.

Point

Pointes Disputable.

Some (6) Catholicke writers teach, that Indulgences are only a payment or recompence of punishment taken out of the treasure of the merits of Christ, and his Saints, and applied by authority of the Pope. (7) Others thinke, that it is not only a payment, but likewise a Iuridicall Absolution. Some (8) teach, that Indulgences are graunted only for punishments imposed. (9) Others better thinke, that they do extend to all punishments due in the sight of God.

Some (10) thinke that a generall Councell without the Pope may giue Plenary Indulgences: But (11) others more probably deny it, and ascribe the same onely to the Pope.

Some (12) thinke, that no proportion is required betweene the Indulgence, and the Cause, for the grant thereof, so that the cause be truly pious, and not meerly temporall or vaine. (13) Others more probably thinke, that the Indulgence is not of force, if there be not obserued proportion, as if for the smalest cause, the greatest Indulgēce should be granted.

Some (14) teach, that to gayne an Indulgence a man must be in the state of grace, not only when he receyueth the Indulgence, but also when he performeth the satisfactory workes imposed for the same. Others (15) thinke, that the state of grace is only required when the Indulgence is to be receiued.

Some (16) teach, that Indulgences profit the dead of Iustice, and of condignity. (17) Others only of Gods bounty and congruity. But these and sundry such like, are not defyned by the Church.

(6) *Durand. in 4. Dist. 20. q. 3. Paludm. lb. q. 4. Antonin. in. 1. par. Sum. tit. 10. c. 3.*

(7) *Dom. Soto in 4. Dist. 21. q. 1. art. 2. Bonauent. in 4. Dist. 20. p. 2. q. 5.*

(8) *Pet. à Soto, lect. 2. de Indulg.*

(9) *Tho. in 4. Dist. 20. q. 1. art. 3. Sylvest. verbo Indulg. q. 2. n. 12*

(10) *Dom. à Soto. in 4. Dist. 21. q. 2. art. 4. Navar. de Iubil. notab. 21. n. 2.*

(11) *Bellar. l. 2. de Indulg. c. 12.*

(12) *S. Tho. in 4. Dist. 20. q. 1. art. 3. Antonin. 1. part. tit. 10. c. 3. §. 2.*

(13) *S. Bonau. in 4. Dist. 20.*

Pro-

par. 2 q. vlt. Cajet. tract. de causa Indulg. Navar. de Iubil. notab. 3. n. 3. (14) *Cajet. tract. 10. q. 2. tract. 15. c. 9. Pet. à Soto. lect. de Indulg.* (15) *S. Antonin 1. part. tit 10. c 3. §. 5. Paiud. in 4. Dist. 29. q. 4. art. 3.* (16) *Dom. à Soto in 4. Dist. 21. q. 2. art. 3. Navar. de Iubil. notab. 22. n. 20.* (17) *Cajet. tract. 16. q. 5. Pet. à Soto, lect. 3. de Indulg.*

Proteſtants Vntruthes.

Caluin very bouldly ſayth of Catholikes, (18) *Let them acknowledge whether theſe be their Decrees; Martyrs by their Death to haue performed more to God, and merited, then was needfull for them: and ſo great plenty of merits to haue abounded to them which might redound to others: Leſt therefore ſo great a good ſhould be in vayne, their bloud to be mingled with the bloud of Chriſt, and of both, the treaſure of the Church to be made, for remiſſion and ſatisfaction ſinnes.* By theſe imputations we acknowledge, that Caluin was eyther very ignorant, or impudent, or both: for our Decrees truly are, 1. Martyrs by their death haue not performed more to God then was abſolutly needfull for themſelues, but more then was needfull to ſatisfaction for the guilt of their tẽporall punithment. 2. Though we acknowledge ſatisfaction in ſome Saints to abound, yet we deny it of their merits, or that their merits do redound to others. 3. The Paſſions of Saints are not mingled with the Paſſions of Chriſt in the Treaſure, as though theſe of themſelues were not ſufficient to take away all paine eternall and temporal, and all fault originall and actuall, mortall and veniall; but that thereby the excellencies of Chriſts ſuffering might be ſhewed, which was able to communicate to others the vertue and power of ſatisfaction for temporall punithment. 4. The Paſſions of Saints not abſolutly but as they are ſatisfactory, would be without fruite, if neyther themſelues had need of them, neither could be applyed to others, though they be otherwiſe alwaies of great worth in regard of Gods glory, honour to the Martyrs, and profit or example to the Church.

(18) *Inſtit. l. 4. c. 9. n. 42.*

Heſhuſſius (19) chargeth Popes to forgiue ſinnes, and graunt Indulgences for money. But Popes neuer require money for Indulgences or Pardons, but onely command thoſe who deſire to haue the Indulgences, to pray, faſt, and giue Almes, eyther to the Poore in generall, or to ſome pious vſe, as building a Church, or the lyke.

(19) *Deſcr. errorib. & impoſt. tit. 32.*

Chemnitius (20) auoucheth vs to teach, that the tem-

(20) *Exam. part 4. p. 218.*

porall punishment remayning after the fault forgiuen in the Sacrament of Pennance, is greater then can be payd by any man in this life. But this is so vntrue, that we (21) teach a iustifyed man may satisfy *ex condigno*, for the temporall punishment. He further teacheth that, *we cannot* (22) *produce eyther any Testimonies of Fathers, or any examples of the Ancient Church, that eyther such doctrine or vse of such Indulgences was at any tyme in the Ancient Church, vntill the yeare of Christ* 1200. But this will appeare to be most vntrue by the Councels cyted in this Section, by Fathers following in the third Section, and by (23) many histories.

(11) Dominicus à Soto. in 4. sent. Dist. 19. q. 1. art. 4.
(12) Exam. part. 4. p. 274
(13) Alexand. P. 3. ep. ad Episc. Cantuarienſ. & in Iure. c. Quod autem, de pœn. & rem. Author vitæ S. Bernardi. l. 3. c. 4. Abbas Vrſperg. in Chron. Ludgerus in vita S. Suibert.

M. Rogers writeth, (24) *The Romish Doctrine concerning Pardons is &c. To seeke ſaluation not at God alone, but at the hands of ſinnefull men: for would we haue a Pardon &c. for all our ſinnes committed or to be committed? From the Pope we may haue it &c. That we may be our owne Sauiours; How the precious bloud of Christ washed in vaine: for corruptible gold and ſilver, without owne Deeds and workes, may and will ſaue vs, if we will. That Repentance is not of neceſsity vnto ſaluation of man; for without the ſame a Popish Pardon may ſaue: But without eyther a Pardon from the Pope or ſuch like, or Abſolution of a Prieſt, there is no ſaluation, by the Doctrine of the Church of Rome*: or els Rogers lyeth, as he doth most fouly; Catholickes houlding the direct contrary to all that he heer aſcribeth vnto them: ſo ignorant, or maliciously wicked is this Miniſter.

(14) Def. of the Art. art. 22. p. 233.

Proteſtant Doctrine.

The Engliſh Proteſtant Church hath Decreed, that; (25) *The Romish Doctrine concerning &c. Pardons &c. is a fond thing, vainly inuented, and grounded vpon no warrant of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the word of God.* Luther affirmeth that, (29) *Indulgences are the moſt wicked deceiptes, and Impoſtures of moſt wicked Popes.* Caluin profeſſeth, (27) *Indulgences euen cleaned from all ſpot, that is, if they be defyled with no abuſe, to be nothing els but the prophanation of Chriſtes Bloud, and the mockery of Sathan, wherewith they withdraw Chriſtian people from the Grace of God, and from lyfe which is in Chriſt Ieſus, and auert them from the*

(15) Article 22.
(26) Art. 18. à Leone 10. damnat.
(27) Inſtit. l. 3. c. 9. §. 39.

the true way of ſaluation. Thus Proteſtants.

Proteſtants agree with Ancient Hereticks.

The firſt that impugned Indulgences were the *Waldenſes*, who taught that (28) *The Indulgences of Prelates were of no force*: but they were condemned for the ſame in the 3. Laterane Councell vnder Pope Alexander the 3. Wiccliffe alſo defended that, *It was a foolish thing to believe the Indulgences of the Pope and Bishops*: but he was condemned by the Councell of (29) Conſtance. Theſe the Huſſites followed, as appeareth by (30) Cochlæus. And theſe haue Luther and other Prot. for their forefathers.

(28) *Art.* 18.

(29) *Seſſ.* 8.

(30) *L.* 1. *de Hiſt. Huſſitarum.*

SECT. II.

It is proued by Scriptures, that the Church hath authority to grant Indulgences or Pardons for the temporall puniſhment due to ſinne, after the fault is forgiuen.

FOr the cleerer proceeding in this Controuerſy, we are firſt to know, that Indulgences are remiſſions or Pardons of the puniſhmentes which often remayne to be paid after forgiuenes of the fault and reconciliation obtained by the Sacrament of Pennance: hauing proued hertofore that puniſhment often remayneth to be paid after the fault be forgiuen, I muſt yet before I come to the mayne queſtion confirme certaine truthes, which will much auaile for the better vnderſtanding therof.

As firſt, that in the actions of the iuſt a double valour or worth may be aſſigned, to wit, of merit and ſatisfaction. Almesgiuing for example doth merit, ſeeing Chriſt ſaid, (1) *Poſſeſſe you the kingdome prepared for you &c. For I was hungry and you gaue me to eate &c.* And it doth alſo ſatisfy, in that it taketh away ſinne, (2) *Giue Almes, and behould all things are cleane to you.* (3) *Almes deliuereth from all ſinne.* (4) *Water quencheth burning fyre, and Almes reſiſteth ſinnes.* And ſo the ſame

(1) *Mat.* 25. 34. & 6. 4.
(2) *Luc.* 11. 41.
(3) *Tob.* 4. 11.
(4) *Eccl.* 3. 33.

worke is meritorious, as it is a good worke done in Charity, and it is satisfactory, in that it is laborious and painfull. The like might be exemplified in *Fasting* (5) and (6) *Prayer*.

(5) Ionas. 3. 7. 10. & Mat. 6. 18.

(6) Mat. 6. 6. 18.

The second truth is, that a good worke in what respect it is meritorious, it cannot be applyed to others, but as it is satisfactory it may. The first part is cleere, for he is said to merit who doth good, and by his good is worthy of reward; but it cannot be said because one doth well, therfore another doth well, or is worthy of reward. Againe no man can be depriued of his owne merit, though he pray, fast, & giue Almes for others, wherfore he cannot communicate his merit with others. And this is that which the Scriptures teach when they say, (7) *Euery one shall receiue his owne reward according to his owne labour*. The second part is also proued, for satisfaction is a releasing of the Punishment, or paying of the debt: now, one may so satisfy for another mans punishment and pay his debt, that he may truly be said to haue satisfyed and paid. Againe, he that satisfyeth for another, cannot by the same worke satisfye for himselfe, therfore he truly communicateth his Satisfaction with another. A friend may with his owne money so satisfy another mans debt, that it will not serue also to pay his owne: but he cannot by his owne good workes deserue, that another shalbe worthy of some great Office or Magistracy, which otherwise he were not worthy of.

(7) 1. Cor. 3. 8.

But in further proofe that the workes of the iust may help others by way of impetration and satisfaction; it is to be remembred, that as God in his Iustice, doth punish some for the *offences* of others, and *visiteth* (9) *the sinnes of wicked Parentes vpon their Children* to many generations; so likewise his mercy being answerable to his Iustice, and *aboue* (10) *all his workes*, he spareth some for the good deeds of others. Examples in these kinds may be, how God said to Salomon (11) when he had sinned, *I will rent asunder thy kingdome &c. Neuertheles in thy dayes I will not do it because of Dauid thy Father*. So also when Abias had offended, God was mercifull vnto him. (12) *for Dauids sake &c. because Dauid had done right in the eies of our Lord*. God protesteth his mercy to Isaac, (13) *because Abraha had*

(9) Exod. 20. 5.

(10) Psal. 144. 9.

(11) 3. Reg. 11. 12. 13.

(12) 3. Reg. 15. 4. 5.

(13) Gen. 26. 5.

had obeyed (his) *voyce, and kept* (his) *Precepts.* And (14) *If I ſhall fynd in Sodome 50. iuſt perſons within the City, I will ſpare the whole place for their ſake.* (14) Gen. 18. 26.

S. Paul perſuadeth the rich Corinthians to releeue liberally the poore Chriſtians in Hieruſalem, ſaying, (15) *Let in this preſent tyme your abundance ſupply their want; that their abundance alſo may ſupply your want, that there be an equality.* So plainly doth he teach, that the Satisfactory Deeds of one man, may be auaileable to others: yea, and that holy Saintes, or vertuous perſons may in meaſure and proportion of other mens neceſſities and deſeruings, allot vnto them, aſwell the Supererogation of their ſpirituall works, as theſe that aboũd in worldly goods may giue almes of the ſuperfluities to them which are in neceſſity: which enterchange, communion, and proportion of thinges the Apoſtle doth here euidently ſet downe. (15) 2. Cor. 8. 14.

The third truth to be proued is this, In the Church there is an infinite treaſure of ſatisfactions from the ſufferings of Chriſt, which can neuer be ſpent. Chriſt his Paſſion being the Paſſion of an Infinite perſon was of infinite valew, but the worth of Satisfaction receiueth its meaſure from the worth of the perſon ſatisfying, euen as the greatnes of offence is meaſured by the worth of the perſon offended: therfore Chriſt his Paſſion or Satisfaction was of infinite value.

Againe, Chriſt ſuffered for all men (as is proued (16) elswhere) but it is more then certaine, that to all thoſe who haue hitherto liued, Chriſt his ſufferings haue not bene actually applyed for the pardon of their ſinnes, the greater part being damned; wherfore much of that price remayneth, which may alwaies be applyed, though it were not infinite, as indeed it is: And this the rather, ſeeing all the Satisfaction of Chriſt may be applyed to vs, himſelfe neuer ſinning, needing no ſatisfaction for himſelfe. (16) See Hereafter chap. 30.

The fourth truth; To this Treaſure of ſuperaboundant Satisfactions, belong alſo the ſufferings of the B. V. Mary, and of all other Saintes, who haue ſuffered more then their ſinnes required. Suppoſing firſt, that Satisfaction for the fault and guilt of eternall punishment is not made by the ſuffe-

ring of any Saintes, but only by the Bloud and ſuffering of Chriſt, the forſaid truth concerning the B. Virgin Mary is proued, in that according to the vniforme doctrine of the Church, (17) ſhe neuer committed the leaſt actuall Sinne, and therfore to her moſt aptly are applyed thoſe wordes, (18) *Thou art all faire, O my loue, and there is not a ſpot in thee:* wherfore ſhe needed not any ſatisfaction for herſelfe, and yet ſhe ſuffered much for God, and eſpecially when according to S. Simeons prophecy, (19) *a ſword ſhould pierce her ſoule.* The like might be ſhewed of S. Iohn Baptiſt, who from his mothers wombe was ſanctifyed, liuing after moſt auſterely, and ſuffering impriſonment, and death. As alſo of the Prophets, who being moſt holy men, yet (20) ſuffered exceeding much: In ſo much as one of them ſaid, (21) *Would god my ſinnes were weighed wherby I haue deſerued wrath, & the calamity which I ſuffer, in a ballance. As the ſand of the ſea this would appeare heauier.* S. Paul reciteth (22) his many and moſt grieuous ſufferinges, and yet how litle he had to ſatisfye for his ſinnes, himſelfe teſtifyeth, ſaying, (23) *I am not guilty in Conſcience of any thing.* And (24) *Our glory is this, the teſtimony of our Conſcience, that in ſimplicity and ſincerity of God &c. We haue conuerſed in this world.* And he particularly (25) numbreth the like ſufferings of all the Apoſtles, who no doubt liued moſt holy liues. And the like might be ſaid of Martyrs, and holy Confeſſours.

(17) Conc. Trid. Seſſ. 6. Can. 23. Ambr. ſer. vlt. in pſ 118. Aug l. de Nat. & Gra. c. 36 Bern. Ep. 174.
(18) Cant. 4. 7.
(19) Luc. 2. 35.
(20) Heb. 11. 32.
(21) Iob. 6. 2.
(22) 2. Cor. 11. 23. &c. And 2. Cor. 1. 5. 8.
(23) 1. Cor. 4. 4.
(24) 2. Cor. 1. 12.
(25) 1. Cor. 4. 9. &c.

Theſe truthes ſuppoſed, I am now to proue that in the Church there is power to apply the forſaid treaſure to ſuch as haue need therof. And firſt that the ſaid treaſure may be applyed, it appeareth by the Article of Communion of Saintes, for therby we are taught, that all the faithfull are ech others (26) members, and as it were one liuely Body: and as the liuely members do help one another, ſo the faithfull do Communicate their goods ech to other, ſpecially when thoſe that are ſuperfluous to one, are neceſſary, or very profitable to another. The ſame is alſo proued from the words of S. Paul, (27) *I moſt gladly will beſtow, and will my ſelfe moreouer be beſtowed for your ſoules.* (28) *I ſuſtaine all thinges for the Elect.* (29) *I reioyce in ſuffering for you, and*

(26) Rom. 12. 5. 1. Cor. 12. 12.
(27) 2. Cor. 12. 15.
(28) 2. Tim. 2. 10.
(29) Col. 1. 24.

do

do accomplish those things that want of the Passions of Christ in my flesh, for his Body which is the Church. Though these texts may be so expounded, as that S Paul suffered much for the Elect, and the Church, because he exposed himselfe to many dangers and labours that he might preach vnto them, and that by his example he might strengthen the weake, and encourage others: yet it may also be truly vnderstood of the Communication of his sufferings or satisfactions, for these senses do not impugne one another, but may be all admitted. The Apostle desired to profit the faythfull by all wayes he could, now he might greatly profit them by communicating his Passions, which were superaboundant to him, as I haue formerly shewed, therefore no doubt by this way he did help them. And so by suffering he fulfilled those things, which were wanting of the Passions of Christ, that is, such as Christ in his Saintes was yet to suffer for the Body of his Church.

Now, that this Treasure is to be dispensed and applyed by the Churches Pastours, it appeareth by these wordes of Christ to S. Peter, (30) *whatsoeuer thou shalt loose in Earth, it shalbe loosed also in the heauens:* and these also to all the Apostles, (31) *Whatsoeuer you shall loose vpon Earth, shalbe loosed also in heauen.* These promises are most ample, generall, and not restrayned only to sinnes, as these others are, (32) *whose sinnes you shall forgiue &c.* but they include all Bonds which may hinder the attayning of Eternall Saluation, as absoluing from censures, dispensing in lawes, vowes, oathes, vpon iust occasion.

(30) *Mat.* 16. 19.

(31) *Mat.* 18. 18.

(32) *Io.* 20. 23.

According to this we read, that S. Paul himselfe gaue Indulgēce to the Incestuous Corinthian, saying (33) *Whome you haue pardoned any thing, I also: for my selfe also that which I pardoned; If I pardoned any thing for you, in the person of Christ, that we be not circumuented of Sathan.* The Incestuous Corinthian being (34) excommunicated, and put to Pennance by S. Paul, heere at the intreaty of S. Timothy, and S. Titus (as Theodoret thinketh) as also vpon his owne serious repentance, was by S. Paul absolued, and the rest of his Pennance pardoned: which S. Paul professeth to do in *the person of Christ* that

(33) 2. *Cor.* 2. 10.

(34) 1. *Cor.* 5.

that is, by authority receiued from him.

Reaſon alſo confirmeth this, for in euery well gouerned Commonwealth, it belongeth to the Prince, and his chiefe Magiſtrats to diſpenſe the Cõmon treaſures or goods: And it alſo belongeth to them to admit the ſatisfaction of one for another, when they ſhall iudge it profitable for the Kingdome: wherefore the like is alſo to be granted to the Church.

(1) Survey of Popery part 3. c. 11.

(2) Vpon the Reuel. p. 84.

SECT. III.

(21) *In Act. Rom. Pont. p. 46. 47.*

That the Ancient Fathers do agree with Catholickes in the Doctrine of Indulgences.

(4) Chronogr. p. 48.

(5) In his Euſebius Captiuus publiſhed by Pezelius, vnder the title of 1. Diei de Indulg. fol. 48.

(6) Cyprian Valera of the liues of Popes Engliſhed p. 32. Humfred. in Ieſuit. part. 2. Rat. 5. p. 5. & 617.

(7) Cent. 5. c. 6. Col. 692.

(8) Of the Church. l. 1. c. 17 p. 33.

(9) Vpon the Reuel. p. 363.

M. Bell acknowledgeth, that (1) *Pardons ſealed with lead, called the Popes Bulles, were graunted by Pope Adrian, Anno 772.* The Prot. writer M. Symonds confeſſeth that (2) *S. Gregory remitted Canonicall Pennance, and promiſed cleane remiſſion of ſinnes to ſuch as frequented Churches on ſet dayes.* Bale affirmeth that, (3) *Gregory confirmed by Indulgences Pilgrimages to Images for the Deuotion of the people: And that he was a defendour of Pardons, yet not a ſeller;* As alſo that *he firſt graunted Pardons for ſet dayes, and to ſuch as viſited Churches.* In like manner Pantaleon auoucheth of him that, (4) *He firſt graunted Pardon of ſinnes to the people viſiting Churches vpon ſet dayes, in Decret. and in 3. Pſal. Panit.* Hieronymus Marius thinketh, that (5) *Gregory the 1. and Boniface the 8. were the chiefe Authors of Pardons.* And the lyke is confeſſed of Saint Gregory by other (6) Prot. writers.

But to cleere S. Gregory of all Innouation in this point, the Centuriſtes acknowledge that S. Chryſoſtome mentioneth (7) *Dayes of Indulgence and Pardon.* And D. Field confeſſeth that, (8) *The Ancient Biſhops were wont to cut of great parts of enioyned Pennance, which Remiſſion was called an Indulgence.* Yea M. Nappier affirmeth, that, (9) *In the 10 Articles of the 1. Councell of Nice are ſuperſtitious rytes, euen the obſeruation of dayes, to wit, of Peace* (or Indulgence) *and ſuperſtitious Pennances.*

But to aſcend yet higher, Tertullian in his Booke *de Pudicitia*

dicitia (writen after he became an hereticke) doth euen by his impugning (10) of the Churches then practiſe in granting Indulgences vpon the Martyrs Interceſſions, giue ſufficient teſtimony to the Churches allowance thereof: whereto himſelfe, in his other writings, when he was Catholike, giueth alſo his owne (11) allowance. As alſo doth Cyprian mentioning (12) Peace, or Indulgence giuen vpon the Interceſſion of Martyrs, before the parties enioyned Pennance was accompliſhed.

(10) *L. de Pudic prope fin.*

(11) *L. ad Martyres poſt initium*

(12) *L. 3. Ep. 15. 16 18. & lib. de lapſis.*

And whereas it is proper to Catholicke Doctrine to haue no firſt beginning knowne therof, vnles we aſcend to the Apoſtles and the Scriptures; Hereſies alwaies hauing their firſt authour, tyme and place obſerued, and remembred; it is moſt certaine that no man yet was euer able to name the firſt Authour of Indulgences, or the place & tyme wherin it was firſt preached: yea all, whether Doctours, Popes, or Councels, who make any mention therof, do ſpeake of it as a thing vſuall and receiued. And though Chemnitius would haue it thought, that this our Doctrine of Indulgences, (13) had it beginning *not long before the yeare of Chriſt* 1200. yet this is cleerely refelled by the former graunts of other Proteſtants, for the much more ancient tymes of S. Gregory, S. Chriſoſtome, the Concell of Nice and Tertullian; as alſo by ſundry (14) writers and Councels much ancient to the tyme preſcribed of 1200. yeares. Wheras it is cleere not only by all Catholicke writers, but euen by Chemnitius, that the Waldenſes who liued about the yeare 1170. were (15) the firſt that impugned Indulgences.

(13) *Exam. pars. 4. p. 71.*

(14) *Ludgerus Ep. de S. Swiberto apud Surium. Tom. 2. Conc. Claromontanum apud Antonin. 2. part. hiſt. tit. 16. c. 1. § 23. Conc. Later. apud Vſperg. in Chron. 1116.*

(15) *Exam. pars. 4. p. 83.*

SECT. IV.

Proteſtant Writers teaching Indulgences.

IOhn Huſſe being accuſed as an Impugner of Indulgences, excuſeth himſelfe in theſe wordes, (1) *I am falſly accuſed to teach, that Indulgences were nothing.* Yea I affirme, that,

(1) Tom. 1. fol. 9.

that, (2) *The Pope who is the immediate Vicar of Christ hath authority to graunt Indulgences &c.*

(2) *Quæstione de Credere. fol. 170.*

Luther himselfe granteth, that, (3) *Indulgences do take away punishments imposed by Bishops, and holy Fathers &c. Bishopes and Curats are bound to admit with all reuerence the Commissaries of Apostolicall Pardons.* So that according to these two prime Protestantes, the Church hath authority to graunt Indulgences.

(3) *In Resolutionibus de Indulgentijs*

SECT. V.

Obiections against Induldgences answered.

MAny do (1) obiect, that our Doctrine of Indulgences doth derogate from the sufficiency of Christes Merites, Passion and Satisfaction, as though they without the Merits of Martyrs, Saintes, and our owne sufferings, were not sufficient to satisfy for the sinnes of the whole world, wheras the Scriptures euery where testify, that Christ by his Bloud satisfyed for the sinnes of the whole world. Answ. All Catholickes confesse that Christ hath most fully satisfyed for the sinnes of the world; but it doth not thence follow, that we are not to satisfy for the temporall punishment due vnto our sinnes: euen as it is most true, that Christ by his Bloud merited for vs grace and glory, and yet we must seeke grace by faith and the Sacraments, and glory by stryuing and running for it. The reason herof is, because the price of our Redemption and Satisfaction paid by Christ, profitteth only those to whom it is applyed by certaine meanes or Instrumentes: for no other cause can be alleadged, why Pagans, Turkes, and Iewes are not saued, seeing Christ dyed and satisfyed for all. Now these meanes we affirme to be Faith, Baptisme, Contrition, Confession and Satisfaction: Neither do we adioyne these meanes to Christes Satisfaction, as though this of it selfe were not sufficient; but becaus it pleased him to giue vs this power to satisfy, that the Efficacy of his Bloud might the more shine, when not only

(1) Rogers Def. of the Art. art. 22. p. 123.

only himſelfe ſatisfyed, but that he communicated the power of Satisfaction, for temporall puniſhment, to his members.

Others obiect, that Durand and ſome other Catholicke writers do acknowledge that the Doctrine of Indulgences is not to be found in the Scriptures. Anſw. Though it be not taught in particular, and expreſſe wordes, which is all that Durand and others affirme, yet the grounds therof I haue formerly deduced out of the Scriptures. And though it were not at all in the Scriptures, yet thence it would not follow, that it were a Doctrine humane and only Eccleſiaſticall, ſeeing many articles are beleiued as diuine, which are no where taught in the Scriptures, as hath bene proued (1) hertofore.

(1) See heretofore, chap. 7.

It is yet further vrged that ſome Indulgences haue been granted for 20000. yeares; whereas if any were to be puniſhed ſo long in Purgatory, doubtles they were to be puniſhed long after the day of Iudgement. Anſw. Some thinke there were neuer any ſo graunted by any Pope, but that they were forged by Officers for their profit: for Popes do but vſe to grant them for ſo many yeares, as Pennances were accuſtomed to be enioyned, which were for the moſt but for a mans life, which ordinarily is not aboue 100. yeares. But howſoeuer this be, it cannot be denyed, but that according to the Canons ſome deſerue Pennances for ſome thouſands of yeares; for if for one mortall ſinne, the Canons do enioyne ſometymes 3. yeares, ſometymes 7. for puniſhment, who is able to number the yeares, which according to the Canons were to be enioyned to ſuch as hourely ſweare, forſweare, blaſpheme, and frequently murther, rob &c. And therefore if Indulgences of many thouſand yeares haue beene graunted by any Pope, no doubt it was in this foreſaid reſpect. But as in this life many yeares Pennance may be ſatisfyed in one houre through the feruour of Charity and Contrition, ſo the vehemency of the paine in Purgatory, may ſatisfy in 300. or 400. yeares, that which otherwiſe might require 10000.

Others yet obiect, that ſome Indulgences do pardon both

both the fault, and the punishment. Answ. This is onely meant in regard, that with Indulgence Confession is ordinarily ioyned, by which the fault is pardoned. And therfore when it is said, that by Indulgences sinnes are pardoned, it is only vnderstood in regard of the punishment, the fault being supposed to be formerly forgiuen by the Sacrament of Pennance.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXVII.

The true State of the Queſtion concerning preſcribed dayes for Faſting, and Abſtinence from certaine meates.

Whether certayne dayes preſcribed by the Church for Faſting: as alſo Abſtinence at ſome tymes from certaine meates, be things lawfull, and to be obſerued vnder ſinne: or rather that they are to be left free according to euery mans Deuotion, and lyking.

SECT. I.

Catholike Doctrine.

PROTESTANCY euer hauing for an indiuiduall Companion Senſuality, will by no meanes admit of appointed faſtes, or abſtinēce from the better meates: whereas the Church of Chriſt for iuſt reaſons doth command both. So in the Laodicene Councell it is ordained, that, (1) *We ought not to breake faſt in Lent vpon Thurſday in the laſt weeke, and diſhonour the whole Lent, but that it is more meete to honour the whole Lent with ſtrict faſting.* In the Councell Agathenſe it is decreed, that, (2) *All the ſonnes of the Church do faſt in Lent, Sundayes excepted &c.* In the eight Councell of Toledo it is defyned, that, (3) *whoſoeuer without inexitable Neceſ-*

(1) *Can. 5.*

(2) *Cap. 12.*

(3) *Cap. 9.*

sity and weaknes, and manifeſt infirmity or impoſsibility of Age, ſhall preſume to eate fleſh in the dayes of Lent, he ſhall not only be guilty of our Lords Reſurrection, but alſo ſhallbe made an alien from the holy Communion of that day: And this ſhalbe added to his Punishment, that for that yeare he ſhallabſtaine from all eating of fleſh &c. But thoſe whome eyther Age hath bowed, or Infirmity weakened, or neceſsity vrged, let them not before preſume to violate the things forbidden, then they haue receyued licence from the Prieſt. In the Councell Gangrenſe it is ſayd, (4) *If any man ſhall diſsolue the faſtes which are commonly kept by the Church, Anathema.* And the like is taught by ſundry other (5) Councels.

(4) *Can. 20.*
(5) *Conc. Triburienſe. can. 35. Conc. Carthag. 4. Can. 63. Conc. 6. Conſtantinop. Can. 56.*

The Common (6) opinion of all Catholickes is, that they are bound in Cõſcience to obſerue ſuch dayes of faſts, & Abſtinence from ſuch meates, as the Church ſhall commãd: and that the infringing of theſe without iuſt cauſe is ſinfull.

(6) *Bellar. de bonis oper. in partic. l. 2. c. 7. Rhem. Teſt. in 1. Tim. 4. 3.*

Pointes Diſputable.

Some (7) Catholike writers teach that, ſo often as a man eateth vpon a day of faſt after his firſt refection, ſo often he ſinneth. But (8) others thinke, that he only ſinneth after the firſt eating. (9) Some affirme that ſuch as haue Priuiledge to eat fleſh vpon faſting dayes, are yet obliged to one meale or refection. But (10) others deny it, and ſundry ſuch like are diſputed, and not defyned by the Church.

(7) *Io. Medina q 3. de ieiunio.*
(8) *Durand. in 4. Diſt. 15. q. 11. Silueſt. Verbo, Ieiunium.*
(9) *Nauar. c. 21 n. 22.*
(10) *Azor. l. 7. c. 10 q. 3.*

Proteſtant vntruthes.

Chemnitius affirmeth that, (11) *Teleſphorus ordayned the faſt of Lent.* But this is moſt vntrue, for he (12) only decreed that the Clergy ſhould adde 3. dayes to the cuſtomed faſt of all Chriſtians. He alſo chargeth *Calixtus to haue ordained the 4. Ember weekes:* but (13) he only added one to the former three, which we haue from Apoſtolicall Tradition. He (14) auoucheth Catholikes to teach, that *faſting of it ſelfe* (and as he ſayth) *ex opere operato*, is able to appeaſe, or ſatisfy God without any other help of good workes or Grace, which is a meere fiction of his owne, not a Doctrine taught by any Catholike writer.

(11) *Exam. ad 4. Seſſ.*
(12) *In Ep. ſua.*
(13) *Ep. 1.*
(14) *Exam. ad Seſſ. 25.*

Pro-

Proteſtant Doctrine.

Luther teacheth that, (15) *It is erroneous and falſe, in that they impoſe a neceſsity of faſting at certaine tymes of the yeare, as the Vigils of the Apoſtles, and other Saintes: And this, vnder grieuous ſinne, as a Decree and Commandement of the Church; For faſting, for as much as concerneth dayes and meates, ought euer to be free and indifferent.* Perkins, (16) *The Papiſtes preſcribe a certaine choyce of meates vpon faſts: but we iudge that difference of meates to be foolish and pernicious.* Others teach, that (17) *The faſt of Lent hath Teſtimony of Antiquity, but none out of the Apoſtles writings, and therefore ought not, or cannot be impoſed on the faithfull &c. And the Apoſtle calleth the Doctrine of thoſe, which teach to abſtaine from meates, the Doctrine of Deuils.* But how impertinent and vntrue this is, we ſhall ſee hereafter.

(15) *De Deitrinis hominum vitandis.* Calu. Inſtit. l. 4. c. 12. §. 20. 21.
(16) *Reform. Cath. Controu. 12. c. 2. col. 434.*
(17) Harm. of Conf. p. 482.

Proteſtantes agree with Ancient Heretickes.

For the impugning of preſcribed Faſts S. Auſtine (18) and S. Epiphanius (19) condemne Ærius: of whom D. Fulke ſaith, (20) *He taught that faſting dayes are not to be obſerued.* Yea ſaith D. Field (21) *He diſliked ſet faſts &c. he was iuſtly condemned.* And according to Oſiander, he not only taught that, (22) *Set faſts are not to be obſerued &c. but that according to liberty a man is to faſt when he will.* In which he was ſo purely Prot. as that D. Whitaker affirmeth that, (23) *Aerius taugh nothing concerning faſting different from the Catholicke faith,* by which he meaneth his owne Prot. Faith. S. Auſtine alſo reproueth Iouinian for ſaying, (24) *Faſts, or Abſtinence from certaine meates do nothing profite.* Yea he auoucheth further, that (25) *To belieue, that ſuch as abſtaine from wyne and flesh haue no greater merit, is not the part of a Chriſtian, but of Iouinian.* This Cenſure of S. Auſtin is cõfeſſed in him (26) by Chemnitius. Doctour Humphrey, (27) *We grant it to be true what Sanders hath of the Iouinianiſts and vs, Faſt and Abſtinence from certaine meates to profit nothing.* And Iouinian is further defended herein (28) by Abbot, Willet, and Danæus.

(18) *Har. 53.*
(19) *Har. 75.*
(20) Anſwere to a Counterf. Cath. p. 44. 45.
(21) Of the Church. l. 3. p. 138.
(22) Cent. 4. p. 414.
(23) *Cont. Dur. l. 9 p.* 830.
(24) *Har* 81.
(25) *De Eccl. Dogm c.* 68.
(26) *Exam. part. 4. p.* 142.
(27) *Ad rat. 3. Camp f.* 263.

And

And wheras our pureſt Prot. do keep their ſtricteſt faſts vpon their Sabothes, S. Epiphanius witneſſeth that the (29) *Aerians deſired rather to faſt vpon Sunday, and to eat vpon wedneſday and friday.* S. Auſtine affirmeth, that (30) *To faſt on the Lords day is a great offence, eſpecially ſince the deteſtable hereſy of the Manichees &c. who appoint vnto their hearers this day as lawfull to be faſted vpon.* This laying of S. Auſtine is alleadged by D. Whitgift (31) and the Centuriſts, and the like of S. Ambroſe by (32) Parker.

Luther, (33) *The faſts and haircloathes of Beaſtes are in as great eſteeme with God, as of men, and of the contrary.* Perkins, (34) *Faſting of it ſelfe doth no more profit to gaine the kingdome of Heauen, no more I ſay, then meate or drinke.*

(28) 4. Part. of his Defence of the Ref. Cath. p. 60. Willet. in Antilog. p. 13. Dan. 1. part. alt part. p. 918.
(29) Hær. 75.
(30) Ep. 86.
(31) Defence, p. 501. Cent. 4. Col. 401. 445.
(32) Againſt Symbolyzing part. 2. p. 38.
(33) Tom. 4. in lor. 3 fol. 422.
(34) Reform. Cath. Controu. 6. c. 4.

SECT. II.

It is proued by the Scriptures, that dayes preſcribed by the Church for Faſting; as alſo Abſtinence at ſome tymes from certaine meates, be things lawfull, and to be obſerued.

THat it is lawfull to vſe Abſtinence from certaine meates not condemning the creatures as though they were of their owne natures vncleane and vnlawfull to be eaten, may be proued by the Example of Daniel, ſaying, (1) *I Daniel mourned the dayes of three weekes, deſiderable bread I did not eate, and flesh and wyne entred not into my mouth &c.* S. Iohn Baptiſt abſtained from all meates, ſauing (2) *Locuſtes and wyld-hony.* The Centuriſtes report of S. Iames the Apoſtle, that he abſtained (2) *from wyne and flesh.* The abſtinence of Timothy, though then being ſickly is ſo certaine, that S. Paul therfore aduiſeth him in reguard of his health to (4) *Drinke not yet water, but vſe a litle wyne for thy ſtomacke, and thy often infirmities.* Now none will ſay, that theſe holy perſons, did forbeare theſe meates and drinkes, as thinking them of their owne natures to be vncleane, or vnlawfull.

(1) C. 10. 2. 3.
(2) Mat. 3. 4.
(3) Cent. 1. l. 2. c. 10. Col. 581. and Ægeſip. apud Euſeb. hiſt. l. 2. c. 22.
(4) 1. Tim. 5. 23.

And that this Abſtinence and faſt may be limited by the

the Church to certaine appointed and preſcript dayes, appeareth firſt, in that the thing in generall being it ſelfe lawfull and commendable (in ſo much as it is oftentimes in the Scriptures (5) matched in mention with Prayer) the people may be bound therto at ſet tymes, euen as they are to prayer. 2. Sundry examples are herof in the Scriptures: *Ionadab* (6) *commanded his ſonnes not to drinke wyne: and they haue not drunke vntill this day becauſe they haue obeyed the Commandement of their Father.* In (7) Zacharie mention is made of 4. *Faſts*, which were called *Faſts of Moneths, of the* 4. 5. 7. & 10. which were not commanded by God himſelfe, but by them who gouerned the commonwealth of the Iewes, being brought in vpon ſeuerall occaſions. Mardochæus appointed a *new* (8) *feſtiuall day* to be celebrated for euer (9) with faſts and prayer.

(5) *Luc.* 2. 37. *Mat.* 17. 21. *Mar.* 9. 29. *Act* 13. 2. & 14. 23.
(6) *Hier.* 35. 14.
(7) *C.* 8. 19.
(8) *Heſt* 9. 22.
(9) *Ver.* 32.

Chemnitius (10) hath no better anſwere to theſe ſo plaine Textes, then to reprehend theſe obſeruations of the Hebrewes, and to aſcribe it to ναικολλιαν, a naughty zeale. But in this he manifeſteth intollerable boldnes, and impudency, ſeeing the Scriptures do not reproue but commend theſe lawes of faſts, greatly praiſing Mardochæus and Ionadab, and auouching that thoſe faſts mentioned by Zacharie ſhould be changed into *ioy and great ſolemnities.*

(10) *Exam. part.* 4. *p.* 417. 438.

In the New Teſtament we haue the Apoſtles commanding the Gentils conuerted, & all Chriſtians to (11) *Abſtaine from things immolated to Idols, and blood, and that which is ſtrangled.* And that this was a Command, & of Neceſſity to be kept, appeareth by theſe textes, (12) *It hath ſeemed good to the holy Ghoſt and to vs, to lay no further burden vpon you then theſe neceſſary things.* (13) *Paul commanding them to keep the Precepts of the Apoſtles, and the Ancients.* And Tertullian (14) reporteth, that the Chriſtians would rather dye then taſt *blood* in thoſe firſter tymes. Now if the Magiſtrates in the old Teſtament, and the Apoſtles in the new might make lawes for good ends of Abſtinence from certaine meates, and vpon certaine dayes, which yet were not commanded by God, and theſe lawes to bynd in Conſcience, the Neceſſity therof yet not reſting in the thing, but in the Commandement; no doubt the like power cannot be denyed to the Church, preſcri-

(11) *Act.* 15. 29.
(12) *Ver.* 28.
(13) *Act.* 15. 41.
(14) *In Apologet.*

bing the ſame for other good ends; Eſpecially ſeeing it is certaine, and might eaſily be proued, that the Church of Chriſt hath authority to make Lawes, which do bynd in Conſcience.

SECT. III.

That the Fathers do expound the Scriptures, in proofe of the lawfull Abſtinence from certaine meates, and the appointed dayes for faſting.

S. Auſtine affirmeth, that faſting in generall is commanded by the Scriptures: (1) *I pondering* (ſayth he) *that in my mynd, do ſee faſting to be commanded in the Euangelicall and Apoſtolicall letters, and in the whole Inſtrument, which is called the New Teſtament. But what dayes we ought not to faſt, and what to faſt, I do not fynd it defyned by command of our Lord or the Apoſtles.* Wherfore concerning this laſt he further teacheth that, (2) *In theſe things wherof the diuine Scripture decreeth nothing certaine, the cuſtome of the people of God, or the Ordinances of our Anceſtors, are to be kept for a Law.* And when the cuſtome of the people is different, then ſaith he, (3) *The Cuſtome of them are to be followed to whom the Gouernment of the people is committed.* Yea, (4) *There is no better diſcipline in theſe things for a graue and wiſe Chriſtian, then to do ſo, as he ſeeth the Church to do, where he is reſorted.* And then relating how that for the ſatisfaction of his Mother he demaunded of S. Ambroſe what was to be done, when the cuſtome of faſting was various, he reporteth S. Ambroſe his Anſwere to be this, *To what Church thou ſhalt come, keep the Cuſtome therof, if thou wilt not giue ſcandall to any, or any to thee: when I had tould this to my Mother, ſhe willingly imbraced it. And I often thinking of this his ſentence, I did euer ſo eſteeme it, as if I had receyued it from a heauenly Oracle.* S. Ambroſe applyeth thoſe words of the Apoſtle, (5) *Let vs eate and drinke, to morrow we ſhall dye,* to our moderne Epicureans that take away faſting, and deny the merit therof: (6) *How can we be ſaued* (ſaith he) *if we waſh not away our ſinnes by faſting, ſeeing the Scriptures ſay,*

(1) Ep. 80. ad Caſulanum.
(2) Ibid.
(3) Ibid.
(4) Ep. 118. ad Ianuarium. c. 2.
(5) 1. Cor. 15. 32.
(6) L. 20. Epiſt. ep. 82.

Faſting

Faſting and Almes deliuer from ſinne? What are theſe new Maiſters then, that exclude all merit of faſting? Is not this the very voyce of the Heathen ſaying, Let vs eate and drinke, to morrow we ſhall dye?

Concerning the faſt of Lent, S. Auſtine affirmeth that, (7) *The faſt of Lent hath authority both in the old bookes, from the faſt of Moyſes and Elias, & in the Goſpell, becauſe our Lord faſted ſo many dayes, ſhewing that the Ghoſpell doth not differ from the Law and the Prophets.* And of the bond therof he auoucheth that, (8) *to faſt other daies is a remedy or reward, in Lent not to faſt is ſinne. He that faſteth another tyme ſhall receiue Indulgence, he that faſteth not in Lent, ſhalbe punished.* Yea, ſaith S. Ambroſe, (9) *It is no light ſinne to violate the Lent appointed by our Lord for the faithfull &c. therefore if thou wilt be a Chriſtian, thou muſt do what Chriſt did. He that ſinned not, faſted Lent, wilt not thou who ſinneſt, faſt Lent?* And againe, (10) *ſome dayes agoe preaching the Deuotion of holy Lent, I brought forth Examples of holy Scriptures, wherby I might proue, this number of fourty, not to be ordained by men, but conſecrated from beauen, nor to be inuented by Earthly thoughts, but commanded by heauenly Maieſty &c. Theſe Commandements are not ſo much the Prieſtes, as Gods. And therfore he that deſpyſeth (them) deſpiſeth not the Prieſt, but Chriſt, who ſpeaketh in his Prieſt.*

(7) Ep. 119. ad Ian. c. 13.
(8) Ser. 82. de Temp.
(9) Serm. 13. de Quadrage-ſima.
(10) Serm. 38. de Quadrag.

Laſtly S. Hierome ſpeaking of the practiſe and obligation of his tymes ſaith, (11) *We in the whole yeare faſt one Lent, according to the Tradition of the Apoſtles, at a tyme fitting for vs. The (Montaniſtes) make 3. Lents in the yeare, as though three Sauiours had ſuffered. Not that it is not lawfull to faſt all the yeare, excepting Penteceſt, but that it is one thing to offer a guift of neceſſity, another freely.* And (12) *our Lord faſted 40. dayes in the deſart, that he might leaue to vs the ſolemne daies of faſting.*

(11) Ep. 54. ad Marcellam.
(12) Ad c. 58. Iſaiæ.

The Fathers of the Councell Senonenſe do Decree that, (13) *as concerning the chaunce of meates, although &c. now nothing is to be ſaid commune or vncleane, yet nothing cold be ordained more holy or profitable &c. then that vpon the dayes of faſting and Abſtinence ordayned by the Church, forbearing the eating of flesh, we ſhould only eate dry meates: for truly the Authority of our holy Mother the Church is no leſſe with vs, then with the ſonnes of Rechab the Command of their dying Father, who leſt they ſhould infringe the Ordinance of their Father, did perpetually abſtaine from wyne.*

(13) Decret. 7.

Preſcribed faſtes were ſo generally vſed in the Primitive Church, that Caluin ſaith, (14) *I cannot altogether excuſe the Ancient* (Fathers) *in this reſpect, but that they layd ſome ſeeds of ſuperſtition &c. The obſeruation of ſuperſtitious Lent was then euery where in force.* Chemnitius acknowledgeth, that, (15) *Ambroſe, Maximus, Theophilus, Hierome, and others do affirme the faſt of Lent, to be an Apoſtolicall Tradition.* And the very ſame is confeſſed by Scroderus. (16) And wheras S. Auſtine teacheth, that, (17) *Not to keepe Lent at all is Sacriledge, and in part to breake it is ſinne,* this is confeſſed and diſliked in S. Auſtine by the Centuriſtes (18), and Hamelmanus. Scultetus (to vſe his owne words) affirmeth, (19) *The ſuperſtition of Lent and faſting to haue bene allowed and commanded by Ignatius who was ſcholler to S. Iohn.* So ancient and approued is our Catholicke cuſtome of obſeruing preſcript faſtes and Abſtinence from certaine Meates.

(14) *Inſt. l. 4. c. 12. n. 19 20.*

(15) *Exam. part. 1. p. 89.*

(16) *Opuſc. Theol. p. 748.*

(17) *Ser. de Temp. Ser. 77. & 82.*

(18) *Cent. 5. c. 6. Col. 686, 687. Ham. de Tradit. Apoſt. part. 3. l. 3. Col. 814.*

(19) *Medulla Theol. p. 440.*

SECT. IV.

That ſundry Proteſtant writers do teach our Catholicke Doctrine of Abſtinence from certaine meates, vpon Preſcribed daies.

THis Catholike truth is ſo cleere, as that M. Hooker vndertaketh ſpeciall proofe therof, and doubteth not to ſay, (20) *We are &c. to make it manifeſt in all mens eies, that ſet tymes of faſting appointed in ſpirituall Conſiderations to be kept by all ſortes of men, tooke not their beginning either from Montanus, or any other whoſe hereſies may preiudice the credit and due eſtimation therof, but haue their ground in the law of nature, are allowable in Gods ſight, were in all ages hertofore, and may till the worlds end be obſerued, not without ſinguler vſe and benefit.* Againe, *Of publick inioyned faſts vpon cauſes extraordinary, the* (21) *examples of Scripture are ſo frequent, that they need no particular rehearſall &c. Touching faſts not appointed for any ſuch extraordinary cauſes, but either yearly, or monethly, or weekely obſerued and kept, firſt vpon the nynth day of the Moneth &c.* And, then reckoning vp the ſeuerall faſts of the Iewes,

(20) *Eccl. Pol. l. 3. ſect. 72.*

(21) *2. Paral. 20. 3. Ieremi. 36. 9. 1. Reg. 7. 6.*

Iewes, and the cauſes therof, he concludeth, *All theſe not commanded by God himſelfe, but ordayned by a publick Conſtitution of their owne, the Prophet Zachary expreſly toucheth.*

The Prot. Author of the Booke entituled, *Querimonia Eccleſia*, doth purpoſely and at large (22) defend set faſting daies, and Abſtinence from certaine meates, reprouing his other Brethren for reiecting the Ancient Fathers in this behalfe, and condemning Ærius for the now Prot. Doctrine, and vndertaking a particular and large Defence of the faſt of Lent. (22) *2 pag. 90. ad p. 123.*

Caluin acknowledgeth thus much, that, (23) *The other part of Diſcipline, which is not properly contayned in the power of the keyes, conſiſteth in this, that according to the neceſsity of tymes, Paſtours may exhort the People either to faſts, or to ſolemne prayers, or to other Exerciſes of humility, pennance, and faith, the tyme wherof, or manner, or forme is not preſcribed by the word of God, but left to the Iudgment of the Church. The obſeruation of this part, as it is profitable, ſo was it vſuall to the Ancient Church, euen from the very Apoſtles. Neither were the Apoſtles themſelues the firſt authors, but they tooke example from the Law and the Prophets: for we ſee that as often as there hapened any great buſines, the People were aſſembled, Prayers appointed, faſt proclaimed.* M. Trig profeſſeth to defend and vrge againſt his other Prot. Brethren, (24) *the faſt of Lent, & ſolemne weekly faſt of wedneſday and friday.* So free are our appointed faſts from any Doctrine of Deuils, or Superſtition. (23) *In H. 4. c. 12. §. 14.* (24) In his true Catholick. *p. 621.*

SECT. V.

Obiections from Scripture againſt Abſtinence from certaine meates, and Preſcript faſting-daies, anſwered.

THe Ancient Hereticke Iouinian vrged againſt S. Hierome, as Prot. do now againſt Catholickes, that God created all things for man, wheras hens, geeſe, and ſome other Creatures are nothing for his vſe, vnles they be eaten. Anſw. S. Hierome (1) to this Argument of Iouinian anſwerth, that no liuing Creatures were made only for that end, (1) *L. 2. cont. Iouin.*

end, that they should be eaten, but either for phisicke or other vses, or at least for the Ornament of the world. This he proueth in that before the Deluge no man did eate flesh; as also, in that otherwise Owles, Toades, serpents, spiders, and the like were to be eaten, they being not in other respects vsefull for man: besides the forsaid Creatures are eaten vpon certaine daies, though they be abstayned from vpon dayes of Abstinence.

(1) *Mat.15. 11.* Others obiect that, (2) *Not that which entreth into the mouth defyleth a man.* Answ. If this in all respectes were true, then gluttony and drunkenes should not defyle a man: wherfore it is to be said, that though meates of themselues, or their own nature, do not defyle the Soule, yet accidentally in that they make a man to sinne by gluttony or disobedience to God, or our Superiors, they do defyle; And thus is this expounded by (3) S. Austine. Againe, as these wordes do not import that the Iewes then might haue eaten of those meates which God forbad them, no more do they now that are Christians, eate of those which the Church forbiddeth: Neyther they then, nor we now abstayne, for that any meates are of their owne nature abhominable, or defyle the eaters, but they for signification, we for Obedience & Chasticement of our Bodies.

(3) *De moribus Eccl. c.33.*

(4) *Luc.10. 7.* Some argue, that Christ said to his Apostles, (4) *In the same house tarry you, eating and drinking such thinges as they haue.* And that of S. Paul (5) *All that is sould in the shambles eate, asking no question for Conscience.* Ergo, this liberty is not to be taken from vs. Answ. Christ only commandeth that when we are entertayned, we seeke not sumptuous meates, but be content with such as are set before vs: And so is this place vnderstood by S. Ambrose. (6) Neither is it questionable, but that he spake only of such meates, as according to place and tyme were lawfull and profitable, for as then he would not haue had swynes flesh, or poyson eaten, if it had bene placed before them. In like sort S. Paul only freed the faithfull from enquiring whether the flesh had beene offered to Idols or not, for otherwise we haue seene before, that he commanded that the Decree of the Apostles against eating

(5) *1. Cor. 10. 25.*

(6) *In hunc locum.*

that

that which was *ſtrangled, and bloud, and offered to Idols*, ſhould be obſerued.

Againe, that is generally vrged of S. Paul, (7) *In the laſt tymes certaine ſhall depart from the faith attending to ſpirits of Errour and Doctrine of Deuils &c. forbidding to marry, to abſtaine from meates which God created to receiue with thankſgiuing for the faithfull.* Anſwere. The Apoſtle condemneth all Heretickes, who forbid meates as of themſelues vncleane; and for that very cauſe (as S. Chriſoſtome, (8) S. Ambroſe, S. Hierome, and S. Auſtine teach) the Marcioniſtes, Eucratites, and Manichees.

(7) 1. Tim. 4. v. 1. 3.

(8) Chryſoſt. & Ambr. in hunc locum, Hier. l. 1. cont. Iouin. c. 12. & l. 2. c. 1. 2. 5. Aug. l. cons. Adimant. c. 14. & l. 3. cont. Faust. Man. c. 5. 6.

In ſo much, that S. Auſtine purpoſely anſwereth this Obiection ſaying, (9) *See I beſeech you, if this be not greateſt madnes, to thinke that Paul ſaid, that all abſtinence of meates, and forbidding to marry, is the Doctrine of Deuils.* And, (10) *He forbiddeth, who ſaith this is euill, not he who preſcribeth to this good, another thing better.* And againe, *There is great difference betweene thoſe who abſtaine from meates for ſome holy repreſentation, or for paſt thing of the Body; and thoſe who Abſtaine from meates which God hath created, ſaying, that God did not create them. Therfore that is the Doctrine of Prophets and Apoſtles, this of lying Deuils.* And, (11) *The Apoſtle moſt plainly ſignifyeth the (Manichees) when he ſaith, In the laſt dayes there ſhalbe ſome forbidding to marry, abſtayning from meates which God hath created. Theſe be properly deſigned, who do not therfore Abſtaine from ſuch meates, that they may bridle their Concupiſcence, or yield to the Infirmitie of another, but becauſe they thinke fleſh vncleane, and deny God to be the Creatour of them.* Which Errour of the *Manichees* the Catholicke Church hath condemned in (12) ſeuerall Councels.

(9) Cont. Faust. Manich l. 30. c. 4.

(10) Ib. c. 6.

(11) Cont. Adimant. c. 14.

(12) Conc. Tolet. 1. in aſſertione fidei. Bracar. 1. Can. 14.

But not only S. Auſtine, but euen Prot. themſelues anſwere this. M. Hooker ſayth, (13) *Againſt thoſe Heretickes which haue vrged perpetuall Abſtinence from certaine meates, as being in their very nature vncleane, the Church hath ſtill bent herſelfe as an Enemy: S. Paul giuing charge to take heed of them, which vnder any ſuch opinion, ſhould vtterly forbid the vſe of meates, or drinkes. The Apoſtles themſelues forbad ſome &c. but the cauſe of their ſo doing we all know.* And the like Anſwere in our behalfe is giuen by Iacob (14) the Puritane, ſaying, *The place of Paul 1. Tim. 4. 3. is vn-*

(13) Eccl. Pol. l. 5. ſect. 72.

(14) Defence of the

Church and Minist. of Engl. p. 59. 65.

is vnderstood of Marcion and Tatianus, who did absolutely condemne Mariage and certaine meates: and so are in no comparison with the Papistes, if they erred in nothing els.

Neither do these wordes, *In the last tymes*, proue that they are to be vnderstood of some Heretickes which shall come long after the Apostles tymes: for by *last tymes*, the Apostle vnderstandeth the whole tyme from the comming of Christ vntill the end of the world, which tyme he calleth (15) *The ends of the world.* And S. Peter expoundeth of his owne tyme, that which the Prophet Ioel foretould should be (16) *in the last dayes.* And he affirmeth of Christ, that he was (17) *Forknowne indeed before the Constitution of the world, but manifested in the last tymes for you.* Finally S. Iohn said, (18) *Sonnes, it is the last houre.*

(15) 1. Cor. 10 11.
(16) Act. 2. 17 Ioel. 2. 28.
(17) 1. Pet. 1. 20.
(18) 1. Io. 2. 18.

D. Fulke and other Prot. do commonly vrge that, (19) *Montanus the Heretick was the first that appointed lawes of fasting.* But M. Hooker their Brother doth answere them, that the Montanistes were reprehended only, for that they (20) *brought in sundry vnaccustomed dayes of fasting, continued their fastes a great deale longer, and made them more rigorous &c. Whereupon Tertulian maintaining Montanisme, wrote a Booke in Defence of the New fast &c.* And another Prot. explaining this, affirmeth that *Montanus* (21) *abrogating the fastes of the Church, introduceth a new manner of fasting &c.* So weake and impertinent are the obiections made by Prot. against prescribed daies of fasting, and abstinence from certaine meates.

(19) Against Rhem. Test. in Mat. 15. fol. 28. Aretius loc. com. p. 272.
(20) Eccl. Pol. l. 5. sect. 72.
(21) Querimonia Ecclesiæ. p. 110.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXVIII.

The true State of the Queſtion concerning Concupiſcence.

Whether Concupiſcence remayning after Baptiſme, is truly and properly ſinne, though not imputed to the faithfull: or only, that it is an Effect of Originall Sinne; And a corruption of Nature inclining men to Sinne.

SECT. I.

Catholike Doctrine.

THE Errour of Concupiſcence being properly Sinne; being a ſinke from whence many others are deryued, the Councell of Trent therfore hath Decreed that, (1) *The Catholicke Church neuer vnderſtood (Concupiſcence) to be called Sinne, as though truly and properly it were ſinne in the regenerate, but becauſe it is (or aryſeth) from ſinne, and enclyneth to Sinne. If any ſhall thinke the contrary, Anathema.*

(1) *Conc. Trid. Seſſ. 5. Decret. de peccato orig.*

In the Councell of Moguntia it is Decreed, that, (2) *Concupiſcence which is left in vs after Baptiſme, for our Combat, not for fault, is not now ſinne in the true nature of ſin, but therfore called Sinne, becauſe it was cauſed by Sinne, and ſtill enclyneth to Sinne.* In the Councell Senonenſe this Article was condem-

(2) *Cap. 22.*

ned, (3) *Concupiſcence, although there be no actuall ſinne, doth hinder a ſoule from entring into heauen*: But this it could not doe, except it were originall ſinne it ſelfe.

(3) In Anot. poſt Decret. filei.

Agreably to theſe Councels, all (4) Catholikes beleiue, that the Corruption of nature, or Concupiſcence which remayneth after Baptiſme, is not originall ſinne; not only becauſe it is not imputed, but becauſe it cānot be imputed, being of it ſelfe, and its owne nature, no ſinne at all: but only an effect, occaſion, and matter of Sinne, and as it were an Infirmity inclyning to Sinne, but not ſinne it ſelfe without Conſent.

(4) Bellar. de amiſſ. Gra. & ſtatu pec. l. 5 c. 7. & c. Rhem. Teſt. in Rom. 6. 12.

Pointes Diſputable.

Some (5) teach, that Concupiſcence is a poſitiue qualitie in the Soule euer ſtirring vp wicked deſires: But (6) others better, that it only proceedeth from the want of Originall Iuſtice, which did cauſe the ſenſuality to be perfectly ſubiect to reaſon.

(5) Lombar. 2. Sent. Diſt. 31. §. 2. 3. Henric. quodlib 2. q. 21. Greg Arimin. 2. Diſt. 30. q. 2.

(6) Bellar. de pec. l. 5. c 15.

Proteſtant Doctrine.

The Engliſh Proteſtant Church Decreeth, that, (7) *Although there is no condemnation for them that beleiue, and are baptized: yet the Apoſtle doth confeſſe that Concupiſcence & luſt hath of it ſelfe the nature of ſinne*: And ſo by other (8) Prot. it is moſt generally houlden to be truly ſinne.

(7) Articles of Relig. art. 9. Rogers Art. 9. p. 46.

(8) Luther in Aſſert. Art. 2. Calu. Inſt. l. 2. c. 1. §. 8. Calu. Inſt. l. 4. c. 15. ſect. 10. Willet Synopſis. p. 558.

Proteſtants agree with Ancient Hereticks.

S. Epiphanius (9) condemneth the Hereticke Proclus for teaching, that ſinne did alwaies remaine in the Regenerate, and that Concupiſcence was truly ſinne, not taken away by Baptiſme, but brought a ſleepe by faith. And the ſame Errour was afterwards condemned in the Meſſalians, by (10) Theodoret.

(9) Hær. 64.

(10) L. 4 de hær. Fab.

SECT.

SECT. II.

It is proued by Scriptures, that Concupiſcence remayning after Baptiſme, is not truly and properly Sinne.

TO examine this by the ſacred Scriptures, firſt, al ſuch (11) texts as proue that not only debt of puniſhment is pardoned, but euen the fault or ſpots of ſinne are waſhed, purged, and taken away by Baptiſme, do conuince that Concupiſcence remayning after Baptiſme is not ſinne properly taken; But of this I haue ſpoken hertofore. (11) *Sup. chap. 20.*

Secondly, the ſame is cleerly taught in theſe wordes of S. Iames, (12) *Euery one is tempted of his owne Concupiſcence, abſtracted, and allured; Afterwardes Concupiſcence when it hath conceiued bringeth forth Sinne; but ſinne when it is conſummate engendreth Death.* Heere 4. things are diſtinguiſhed, Concupiſcence, that is a power of coueting prone to euill, and her 3. motions, Suggeſtion, Delectation, and Conſent. Concupiſcence and her firſt motion S. Iames doth not call Sinne, but a Temptation to ſinne. Delight, but not fully deliberate, he calleth ſinne, but not mortall: which only full Conſent cauſeth. (12) *C. 1. 14. 15.*

Thirdly, Concupiſcence is the effect and Puniſhment of Originall ſinne. Ergo it cannot be the Originall ſinne it ſelfe; for although one and the ſame thing may be ſinne, and the puniſhment of ſinne, yea & the cauſe alſo, yet this is euer in diuers reſpects; for it cannot be conceiued that one thing may be ſinne, and the puniſhment and effect of the ſame ſinne, becauſe it ſhould be puniſhment and effect of it ſelfe, and, by this, be before, and after it ſelfe. Now that Concupiſcence is the puniſhment and effect of ſinne originall, appeareth by S. Paul, ſaying, (13) *By one man ſinne entred into the world, and by ſinne Death; and ſo vnto all men Death did paſſe in which all ſinned.* Here *Death* is ſaid to be the puniſhment and effect of originall Sinne: now *Death* is parte of the corruption of Mans nature, the other part of the ſame corruption (13) *Rom. 5. 12.*

is *Concupiſcence*, with *Ignorance*, and other wounds inflicted vpon our nature: ſo that the ſame reaſon is of *Concupiſcence*, and *Death*: wheras *Death* is a Puniſhment and effect of Originall ſinne, ſo likewiſe is *Concupiſcence*. And ſo in expreſſe wordes S. Auſtine ſaith, (14) *Concupiſcence is the puniſhment of Sinne.*

(14) *L. 5. in Iulian. c. 3.*

Fourthly, if Concupiſcence be taken for the inuoluntary act, that is, for the firſt motions of Concupiſcence to which the mynd reſiſteth, it is no ſinne, as is cleere in Children, Madmen, and Sleepers, in whoſe power it is not, not to haue the Acts of Concupiſcence. Ergo much leſſe it is ſinne if it be taken for the proneſſe & inclination to ſinne. But neither is it in the power of wyſe and aged men not to haue the firſt motions of Concupiſcence: Ergo, neither is it ſinne in them. Beſides Gods law is not only poſſible, but eaſy to thoſe who are indued with Gods grace: but it is impoſſible, without particular Priuiledge from God, for euen the Iuſt not to haue the firſt motions of Concupiſcence reſiſting the law of their mind, as experience teacheth, and S. Paul himſelfe proued, when he ſaid, (15) *I am delighted with the law of God, according to the inward man: but I ſee another law in my members, repugning to the law of my mynd, and captiuing me in the Law of ſinne, that is in my members.* The ſame alſo is confirmed by thoſe wordes of S. Paul, (16) *But now, not I worke it any more, but the ſinne that dwelleth in me, for I know that there dwelleth not in me, that is to ſay in my fleſh, good.* Theſe words are ſpoken of S. Paul himſelfe, or any other iuſt perſon, in whom Concupiſcence cannot properly be ſinne, becauſe here it is ſaid that the motion of Concupiſcence is not his worke, & therfore cannot be imputed to him to ſinne, ſeeing it is not his. Againe, he affirmeth that this euill is not in him, but in his fleſh, wheras it is certaine that the fleſh is not capable of ſinne properly taken.

(15) *Rom. 7. 22. 23. 2. Cor. 12. 7. 8.*

(16) *Rom. 7. 17. 18.*

Neither will it ſuffice to anſwere with Caluin. (17) that by *fleſh*, is vnderſtood here the whole man, as he is according to Nature corrupted. For if it were ſo to be vnderſtood, then S. Paul had not truly ſaid, *not I worke it*, for how did not he worke that, which the whole man, body, and ſoule

(17) *Inſt. l. 2. c. 1. §. 9.*

foule worketh? But if reaſon reſiſting, which is the chiefeſt part of man, the onely inferiour part doth worke, then it may be truly ſaid, *not I worke it*. Secondly, to what end ſhould he haue ſaid, as it were by way of Correction, *I know that there dwelleth not in me, that is in my fleſh good*, if that euill were in the whole man? Thirdly, S. Paul diſtinguiſheth in expreſſe wordes, the fleſh from the mynd, ſaying, *I ſee* (18) *another Law in my members, repugning to the law of my mynd*, therefore (19) *I my ſelfe with the mynd ſerue the Law of God, but with the fleſh the law of ſinne.*

(18) Rom. 7. 23.
(19) Ib. ver. 25.

All this is yet further eſtabliſhed by theſe other wordes of the Apoſtle (20) *There is now therfore no damnation to them that are in Chriſt Ieſus*; for hauing in the former Chapters ſpoken much of Concupiſcence, he at length concludeth, that the iuſt in Chriſt need not to feare, though they feele in their fleſh that Concupiſcence, reſiſting the law of their mynd. But Luther, Caluin, and others do reply, that the Apoſtle ſaid, There was no damnation to the regenerate for Concupiſcence, not that it did not deſerue damnation, but becauſe God forgaue the guilt therof by Baptiſme. If this anſwere were ſolid, then theſe Prot. affirming the guilt or fault to be forgiuen in Baptiſme, muſt needs conſequently confeſſe, that there is nothing in the regenerate, which is truly and properly ſinne; (21) themſelues teaching the guilt or fault to be that which is properly ſinne: according to that of S. Auſtine, (22) *This is not to haue ſinne, but to be guilty of ſinne.*

(20) Rom. 8. 1.
(21) Calu. in Pſ. l. 3. c. 3. §. 11.
(22) Lib. de Nupt. & concup. c. 28.

SECT. III.

That the Fathers do expound the Scriptures, in proofe, that Concupiſcence remayning after Baptiſme, is not properly ſinne.

SAint Cyril expounding the wordes of S. Iames, affirmeth, that, (1) *A certaine pleaſure goeth before all ſinne, and a burning Concupiſcence vſeth to entice to ſinne, which is before the*

(1) Cyr. l. 4. in Ioan. c. 31.

act of ſinning, and it draweth the conſent of mynd, perſuading that this way we may eaſily come whither we deſyre: which to be true the Diſciple of Chriſt ſheweth ſaying, No man who is tempted, let him ſay, that he is tempted from God. for God tempteth no man: But euery one is tempted of his owne Concupiſcence, abſtracted, and allured: Then Concupiſcence after it hath conceiued, bringeth forth ſinne, but the Conſummation engendreth death.

S. Auſtine alledging the ſame wordes of S. Iames ſaith,

(1) Lib. 5. cont. Iul. c. 5. (2) *Truly in theſe wordes the brood is diſtinguished from that which breedeth. For Concupiſcence is that which breedeth, the brood is ſin: But Concupiſcence begetteth not, vnles it conceiue; it conceyueth not vnles it induce, that is, gayneth the aſſent of the will to commit euill. When therefore it is ſtriuen agaynſt, this commeth to paſſe, that it may not conceyue or trauayle with ſinne.*

I will omit other Fathers, ſeeing Caluin confeſſeth that,

(3) Inſt. l. 3. c. 3. §. 10. (3) *Neyther it is needfull to labour much in ſearching what old writers haue thought therein, ſeeing only Auſtine may be ſufficient for it, who hath faythfully and with great diligence gathered all their opinions. Therefore let the Readers gather out of him, if they will haue any certainty of the Iudgment of Antiquity. But betweene him and vs there ſeemeth to be this difference, that he when he graunteth that the faythfull, ſo long as they dwell in a mortall body, are ſo boulden bound with Concupiſcences, that they cannot but couet (or luſt) yet dareth he not call that diſeaſe Sinne: but being content to expreſſe it by the name of weakenes, he teacheth, that then only it becometh Sinne, when eyther deed, or Conſent is added to conceiuing or apprehenſion; that is, when the will yieldeth to the firſt deſire. But we account the very ſame for ſinne, that man is tickled with any deſyre at all agaynſt the Law of God: yea that prauity it ſelfe which begetteth thoſe deſires in vs, we affirme to be Sinne. Therefore we teach that there is alwayes Sinne in the holy (or iuſt) vntill they haue put off the mortall body, becauſe in their flesh that prauity of deſiring reſideth, which fighteth with that which is right.* So directly (though moſt impudently) doth Caluin oppoſe his Prot. Doctrine of Concupiſcence, to the Catholicke Doctrine of S. Auſtine, and all Antiquity.

(4) Loc. com. part. 3. in his theſes therto annexed. fol. 18. Agreably ſayth Chemnitius, (4) *Auſtine began to diſpute that it was not properly Sinne, but ſo called by a figure &c. which* (if we will beleiue Chemnitius) *was ſpoken incommodiouſly*. But by

by this it appeareth, that S. Auſtine, and Antiquity did hould Concupiſcence without conſent, not to be Sinne.

SECT. IV.

That Proteſtant wryters do teach, that Concupiſcence without Conſent is not properly Sinne.

SZegedine affirmeth that, (5) *Sinne ryſeth, and is perfitted by 3. degrees, Suggeſtion, Delight, and full Conſent &c. He that doth not Conſent, but reſiſteth delight, and temptation, yea refuſeth delight, is not infected with the impurity of Sinne.*

(5) Loc. com. p. 229. And ſee p. 233. 234.

SECT. V.

Obiections taken from Scripture, in proofe that Concupiſcence is properly ſinne, anſwered.

SOne obiect theſe wordes of S. Paul, (6) *Let not ſinne therfore raigne in your mortall Body, that you obey the Concupiſcences therof.* The Apoſtle doth not ſay, let not ſinne be in your mortall Body, but let it not raigne, therfore ſinne is alwaies in vs, though it doth not alwaies raigne, and this ſinne he nameth Concupiſcence. Anſw. The word *Sinne* in Scripture is taken in diuerſe ſenſes, ſometimes properly for the fault, ſometimes for the (7) punithment, which is the effect of the fault, ſometimes for the (8) cauſe of ſinne, and ſometimes for Sacrifice (9) of ſinne. Againe it is euident by the Scriptures, (10) that ſinne properly taken, is taken away in our Iuſtification. And it is no leſſe cleere by the Scriptures, (11) that Concupiſcence is not taken away in Iuſtification. Ergo, according to the Scriptures, Concupiſcence is not properly ſinne. But S. Auſtine ſhall giue the Anſwere, ſaying, (12) *This ſinne wherof the Apoſtle ſo ſpeaketh, is therfore called ſinne, becauſe it is made by ſinne, and is the punishment of ſinne: for it is ſpoken of the Concupiſcence of the fleſh.* Againe, (13)

(6) Rom 6. 12.
(7) Deut. 9. 21. Zach. 14. 19. 1 Tim. 4. 22.
(8) Rom. 7. 7.
(9) 2. Cor. 5. 21 Oſe. 4. 8.
(10) Eſa. 44. 22. Io. 1. 29. Act. 3. 19.
(11) Rom. 7. 22.
(12) L. 2. Retract. c. 25.
(13) L. 1. cont. duas Ep. Pel. c. 13.

Though

Though Concupiſcence be termed ſinne, yet it is not ſo called becauſe it is ſinne, but becauſe it is cauſed by ſinne, euen as a writing is ſaid to be a mans hand, becauſe the hand made it. Moreouer ſinne properly taken cannot be ſaid to be, or raigne in the Body, but in the mynd, for ſinne being Iniuſtice, it muſt needs haue the ſame place that true Iuſtice hath: but no man euer placed Iuſtice in the Body or fleſh, but in the ſoule or mynd.

(14) Rom. 7. 7. Others vrge that of S. Paul, (14) *Sinne I did not know but by the law: for Concupiſcence I knew not, vnles the law did ſay, Thou ſhalt not couet.* Heere S. Paul affirmeth, that he knew Sinne by the law, and that, that ſinne was Concupiſcence, & that the law by which he knew it, was the Commandement, *Thou ſhalt not couet.* Anſwere. Sinne is heere taken properly for the Tranſgreſſion of the law, but Concupiſcence is not heer taken for only proneſſe to ſinne, but for the voluntary act of Coueting, which is forbidden by the law, *Thou ſhalt not Couet.* And this appeareth in that, when the Apoſtle had ſayd, the law was not ſinne, that is the cauſe of ſinne, but the cauſe of knowing ſinne, he thereby proued it, in that men did not know the interiour Acts of deſiring other mens goods, or wyues to be ſinne, vnles the law had ſayd, *Thou ſhalt not Couet.* And ſo accordingly Chriſt himſelfe ſayd, (15) *You haue heard that it was ſayd to them of old, Thou ſhalt not commit Aduoutry; but I ſay to you, that whoſoeuer ſhall ſee a woman to luſt after her, hath already committed Aduoutry with her in his hart.* This he ſpake againſt the Phariſees, who ſtill thought internall euill thoughts not to be ſinne: and the ſame was (16) taught by Ioſephus & Dauid Kimhi; of this Ignorance S. Paul ſpeaketh when he ſayd, (17) *Concupiſcence I knew not, vnles the law did ſay, Thou ſhalt not Couet.* So that Concupiſcence heere is taken for actuall Sinne conſented vnto, & ſo nothing helpeth the cauſe of our Aduerſaries.

(15) Mat. 5. 28.

(16) Antiquit. l. 11. c. 13. Dauid Kimhi in pſ. 66. 17.

(17) Rom. 7. 7.

(18) Chem. Exam. p. 308. Pet. Mart. in Comment. ep. ad Rom. (19) 1. Ioh. 4.

Many (18) vrge that, whatſoeuer is not conformable to the law of God, but differreth from it, is ſinne, according to that of S. Iohn, (19) *Sinne is iniquity:* but the deprauation of mans nature is not conformable to the law of God, but differeth from it; Ergo, it is Sinne. Anſwere. If Sinne and iniquity be taken improperly or materially, then

then as euery fault, not only in manners, but in nature, or art may be called Sinne, so likewise may Concupiscence: but if Snne be taken properly, as S. Iohn doth, for the transgression of Gods law, then Concupiscence is not Sinne or iniquity. Neither is euery thing that differeth from the rule of the law, or that fighteth with it, properly Sinne & iniquity; for the Diuell tempting, man sinning, the will consenting, the action performing, do all of them differ from the rule of the law, and fight with it, and yet none of them are sinne it selfe, which properly consisteth in the deuiation or departing from the rule of the law. Now though Concupiscence doth resist the law of the mynd, yet it is not the formall resistance, nor the action departing from the rule of the law, nor as a power, or person which is bound to follow the law, but as a tempter, or inciter to breake the law, as I sayd of the Diuell.

CHAP. XXIX.

The true State of the Queſtion, concerning the diſtinction of Sinne into Mortall, and Veniall.

Whether all Sinnes be of their owne nature mortall & damnable; and only veniall in the Elect by Gods not imputation: Or rather that there be ſome mortall, others veniall, which of their owne nature do not deſerue eternal punishment, euen in the wicked, and reprobate.

SECT. I.

Catholike Doctrine.

AS in the former Chapter we haue ſeene the endeauour of Prot. to make the inuoluntary Motions of Concupiſcence to be ſinne: ſo in this we ſhall ſee their like labouring to make all ſinnes, euen the leaſt idle word, to be mortall and damnable. Againſt which the Church declaring, that,(1) *All mortall ſinnes ought to be recited in Confeſſion by Penitents &c.* And that, *Veniall ſinnes though they may be rightly and profitably ſpoken in Confeſſion, yet without ſinne they may be concealed*, doth herby cleerly diſtinguiſh the different natures of ſinne Mortal, and Veniall.

(1) *Conc. Trid. Seſſ. 14. c. 5.*

In

In the Councell Senonenſe this Article was condemned for hereticall: (2) *Thoſe who teach veniall ſinnes, to be diſtinct from mortall, do wretchedly endeauour to draw mens Conſciences to Madnes.*

(2) *In Append. poſt Decreta fidei.*

The (3) generall beliefe of the Church now is, that Veniall ſinne of its owne nature is diſtinguiſhed from Mortall; and this without any relation to Predeſtination, or Gods mercy, or the ſtate of the Regenerate, or the like: And that the ſayd veniall Sinne doth deſerue puniſhment, but not eternall: And doth offend God, but not to the loſſe of his fauour and grace.

(3) *Bellar. de amiſſ. gra. & ſtatu pec. l. 1. c. 9. Rhem. Teſt. in Rom. 2. 12.*

Points Diſputable.

Some (4) teach that Sinne Mortall and Veniall, if they be formally conſidered, as they do in different manner offend God, and cauſe different guilt of puniſhment, that then their difference is not eſſentiall, but accidentall, as of the ſubiect into accidents. (5) Others thinke, that the diuiſion of ſinne into Mortall and Veniall, is a diuiſion of Sinne into diuers *ſpecies*, or kindes of ſinne, and ſo a ſmall Veniall theft to differ *ſpecie*, from Mortall theft: but this Opinion is leſſe probable.

(4) *S. Thom. 2. q. 72. art. 5.*

(5) *Nauar. in Manual. Fraiud. 9. n. 6.*

Proteſtants Vntruthes.

Rogers affirmeth that, (6) *Allowed was both whordome and vncleane pollutions by the Carpocratians &c. and is of the Ieſuites and Papiſts.* But this is a manifeſt vntruth forged by Rogers.

(6) *Def. of the Art. art. 12. p. 53.*

(7) *Pulke 48. Rhem. Teſt. in Mat. 5 ſect. 6. fol. 9.*

Proteſtant Doctrine.

Proteſtantes teach, that, (7) *All ſinnes of their owne nature are Mortall:* and yet (8) *all ſinnes are pardonable* (or veniall) *to the faithfull:* for (9) *They are not imputed to the Elect.* Caluin explaineth this Doctrine thus, (10) *We affirme the ſinnes of the faithfull to be veniall, not for that they do not deſerue death, but becauſe that by the mercy of God, there is no Condemnation to them that*

(8) *Ibid. & in 2. Ep. 10. ſect. 3. fol. 447.*

(9) *Ibid. ſect. 3.*

(10) *Inſtit. l. de pœn. c. 3. p. 178.*

are in Christ Iesus. Beza, (11) Hereof it followeth, no sinne to the Elect to be mortall, nor veniall to the reprobate. And so according to these men, the difference of sinnes is not in their owne natures any, but only in regard of the Persons sinning, according to their Predestination, or reprobation.

(11) In 1. Io. 3. 12.
(12) In Paradoxis.
(13) Cont. Pelagianos Dial. 2. & 3.
(14) Hær. 58.
(15) Hier. cont. Iouin. l. 2. c. 15. 16. Aug. Hær. 82.
(16) Tho. Waldens. Tom 2. de Sacram. c. 144.

Protestantes agree with Ancient Heretickes.

Cicero reporteth that with the Stoickes, (12) *All sinnes are alike.* And (13) S. Hierome and S. Austine (14) reprooue Pelagius for teaching that by euery sinne Iustice is lost, and so euery sinne to be Mortall. (15) They likewise impugne Iouinian, for affirming, *All sinnes to be alike.* And the same Errour was afterwards condemned in (16) Wiccliffe.

Protestant Errours.

Dauid (according (17) to Fulke) *when he committed Adultery, was, and remayned the Child of God:* And as Beza (18) thinketh, *By his Adultery and murther did not loose his faith, or the holy Ghost.*

(17) In the Towers Disp. 2. dayes Confer.
(18) Ad acta Colloq. Montisbelg. p. 44.

Luther teacheth that, (19) *As nothing iustifieth but faith, so nothing sinneth but vnbeliefe.* And that, (20) *A Christian or baptized man is so rich, that although he would be cannot loose his Saluation by any sinnes how great soeuer vnles he will not beleeue.* Wotton, (21) *Sinne is forthwith remitted when it is committed, or rather before it is committed, full remission of all sinnes present and to come being obtained by a man once iustified.* Paræus, (22) *Where faith is, no sinne can hurt, what more true?* Paræus denieth that either Dauid by Adultery and murther, or Salomon by Idolatry, or Peter by denying of Christ, (23) *fell from Iustification.*

(19) Loc. com. class 5. c. 27. p. 68. And see Act. Mon. p. 1337.
(20) L. de Captiuit. Babyl. Treatise ag. the Defence of the Censure. p. 198. & in Whitak. cont. Dur. l. 8. p. 630.

Luther, (24) *A Christian is at the same tyme Iust & a Sinner, a Friend and Enemy of God. No Sophisters admitte these contraries, because they do not vnderstand the true reason of Iustification.* Caluin speaking also of the same thing saith, (25) *Behould how contraries may be in the same subiect. For life is begunne, and somewhat of death remayneth.*

(21) Answ.

Luther, (26) *True knowledge of Christ, or faith doth not dis-*

pute

pute whether thou doſt good workes to Iuſtice, or euill to Damnation, but plainly ſo decreeth. Whether thou doſt good workes, thou art not therfore iuſtifyed. whether thou doſt euill, thou art not therfore condemned. And (27) Be a ſinner and ſinne ſtrongly Sinne will not take vs away from Chriſt, although we ſhould committe fornication, or murder a thouſand tymes in one day.

Whitaker. (28) We ſay. if any man haue an Acte of faith, ſinnes do not hurt him. Luther affirmed this, and the ſame we all ſay. And therin you ſay moſt impiouſly, that murther, adultery &c. do not hurt a man, if he only believe.

to the Papiſtes Artic. p. 92.

(27) De Iuſtif. l. 4. c. 2. p. 935.

(28) De Iuſtif. l. 3. c. 14. p. 871.

SECT. II.

It is proued by Scriptures, that all ſinnes are not of their owne nature Mortall, but ſome Mortall, ſome Venial.

THat Sins of their owne natures are ſome Mortal, others Veniall, our Sauiour teacheth ſaying; (1) *Whoſoeuer is angry with his Brother ſhalbe in danger of Iudgement, whoſoeuer ſhall ſay to his Brother, Raca, ſhalbe in danger of a Councell: And whoſoeuer ſhall ſay, Thou foole, ſhalbe guilty of the hell fyre.* Here are ſet downe 3. degrees of Anger, the firſt is internall, when it doth not burſt forth, which ordinarily is leſſe; the ſecond when it is vttered, but without reproach: the third when it tendeth to infamy: of the firſt it is ſayd, that he is in *danger of Iudgment*, that is, (according to S. Auſtine) (2) to be called in queſtion or tryall, whether he haue offended or not: of the ſecond, that he is in *danger of a Councell*; that is, his fault being certaine, but yet it being doubtfull what puniſhment it deſerueth, the Iudges therfore are to meete in Councell to determine the ſame: of the laſt, whoſe fault and puniſhment is certaine, and knowne, it is ſaid, that *he is guilty of Hell fyre*. Now this laſt being knowne to deſerue Hell fyre, and th'other only making the offender guilty of Councell, that is, to be tryed, whether he deſerue Hell or leſſer puniſhment; it hence followeth, that ſome ſinnes there are which deſerue not hell, and ſo not mortall.

(14) Tom. 5. in Cap. 3. Gal. fol. 135.

(25) Cont. Franciſcan. libert. p. 471.

(26) Tom. 5. in Gal. 4. fol. 404.

(27) Tom. 2. Epiſt. fol. 345.

(28) Contron. 2. quæſt. 5. c. 7. p. 514.

(1) Mat. 5. 22.

(2) L. 2. de ſer. Dom. in Monte. c. 9.

Christ also compareth great and litle sinnes to *Camels and gnats*, saying, (3) *Blind guides that straine a gnat, and swallow a Camell.* Betwene which, of their owne natures there is scarce any proportion. Also to *a moate and a beame*; (4) *Hipocrite cast forth the beame out of thy owne eie, and then shalt thou see clearly to take forth the moate out of thy Brothers eye. A moate* may easily be caryed, but the *beame* being importable would not only destroy the eie, but euen depresse the whole body, if it were laid vpon it. Also Veniall Sinne is compared to a *myte* or *farthing*, (5) *Thou shalt not goe out thence vntill thou pay the last myte*, or (6) *the last farthing.*

(1) *Mat.* 23. 24.
(4) *Luc.* 6. 42.
(5) *Luc.* 12. 59.
(6) *Mat.* 5. 27.

S. Paul compareth Veniall Sinne to *wood, hay, stubble*: (7) *If any man build vpon this foundation Gold, siluer, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble, the worke of euery one shalbe manifest.* Here by *gold, siluer, precious stones*, are vnderstood (according to S. Austine (8) and other Fathers) perfect and commendable workes, which examined in Gods Iudgment, shall receiue reward: By *wood, hay* &c. are vnderstood vnpretiable workes, for which the offender shall suffer detriment, but yet shall be saued: which cannot be meant of mortall sinnes, which bring Damnation, and which were more fitly compared to *yron, brasse &c.* as S. Gregory (9) thinketh.

(7) 1. *Cor.* 3. 12. 14. 15.
(8) *L.* 21. *de Ciu. Dei. c.* 26. *Ambr. ser.* 20. *& in ps.* 118. *Hieron. l.* 2. *cont. Iouin. Greg. l.* 4. *Dial. c.* 39.
(9) Ibid.

Christ our Sauiour compareth cleansing of veniall sinne to the washing of the feete. (10) *He that is washed, needeth not but to wash his feete, but is cleane wholly*: here by foulenes of the feete, when all the rest is cleane, is signified manifestly, not our grieuous sinnes, but imperfections of lesse importance.

(10) *Io.* 13. 10.

S. Iames exemplifyeth this in Concupiscence, (11) *Euery one is tempted of his owne Concupiscence, abstracted and allured: Afterward Concupiscence when it hath conceiued, bringeth forth Sinne, but Sinne when it is consummate, engendreth Death.* Heere 3. motions of Concupiscence are set downe, the first inuoluntary, when one is incited to Sinne, but without all consent, & this is not Sinne, but the cause of Sinne, when Consent followeth. The second is imperfectly voluntary, and sinne, but yet but veniall, as being not fully deliberate, and for such distinguished heere from the last, which being with

(11) *C.* 1. 14. 15.

with full Conſent, is ſayd to be conſummate, and to engender death, and ſo mortall.

And whereas D. Fulke replyeth that, (12) *Our Sauiour condemneth luſt of the eye for Aduliery, and Anger for murder, Matt. 5.* I haue ſhewed before, that our Sauiour expreſſed there the ſeuerall degrees of Anger, making onely the laſt Degree guilty of Hell fyre. And as for the luſt of the eye, the words of the Text do only concerne the ſight of the eye, & the luſt of the hart, for the wordes are, (13) *Whoſoeuer ſhall ſee a woman to luſt after, hath already committed aduoutry with her in his hart*; for though the Body were free from act, yet was the hart defyled with Conſent, and this Conſent we affirme to be mortall.

(12) *Ag. Rhem Teſt. in 1 ad. 1. Sect. 6. fol. 416.*

(13) *Mat. 5. 29.*

Some (14) Sinnes are ſuch, as do not ſtand with ſanctity and Iuſtice, but do depriue a man of Grace, and exclude him from heauen: other ſinnes there are which are found euen in the iuſt, and therefore ſuch as may ſtand with Grace and ſaluation, (15) *The iuſt man falleth ſeauen tymes in the day, and riſeth agayne*: our Sauiour hath taught all to ſay, euen the moſt iuſt, *forgiue vs our treſpaſſes*: and Saint Iames, and Saint Iohn, who doubtleſſe were iuſt men, affirme of themſelues and others that, (16) *In many things we offend al*, and that, (17) *If we ſhall ſay that we haue no ſinne, we ſeduce our ſelues, and the truth is not in vs.* Theſe texts cannot be vnderſtood of mortall Sinnes which depriue men of Gods Grace and fauour, and deſerue eternall punihment: for S. Iames and Saint Iohn, were doubtleſſe men iuſt, and who liued in the fauour of God, and not in the ſtate of Damnation.

(14) *Ezech. 18. 24. 1. Cor. 6. 9. 10. Eph. 5. 5.*

(15) *Prou. 24. 16.*

(16) *Iac. 3. 2.*

(17) *1. Ep. 1. 8.*

Some would euade all this, by teaching, that to the Predeſtinate all ſinnes are Veniall by reaſon of Gods not imputing them vnto them, and to reprobate all mortall. But it cannot be denyed, but that Adam, Dauid, Peter, Paul, & ſundry others were Predeſtinate, and yet that they committed haynous deadly ſinnes, it is moſt manifeſt. And I would demand, whether theſe ſinnes of theirs could ſtand, or remayne in them with iuſtifying faith? If not, then they are mortall, ſeeing according to their own grounds, ſuch ſins

are

are mortall which depriue a man of iuſtifying faith; but if the ſaid ſinnes may ſtand with iuſtifying fayth, then a man once iuſtifyed may freely commit murther, Adultery, deny Chriſt with periury, and the like without offence to God, or damnation to himſelfe, ſeeing God doth not impute any ſinne to thoſe that are once iuſtifyed: All which is Doctrine moſt abſurd and pernicious. Beſides it further alſo followeth, that a man Predeſtinate, and once Iuſtifyed, needeth not to pray for remiſſion of his ſinnes, or of any paine due vnto them, ſeeing the ſame are neuer imputed by God, but at the ſame tyme are forgiuen in which they are committed.

SECT. III.

That the Fathers do expound the Scriptures in proofe of the difference betweene Mortall and Veniall ſinnes.

SAint Chryſoſtome expounding theſe wordes of Chriſt, (1) *What doſt thou ſee a moate in thy Brothers eye?* ſaith: *Here, as it appeareth, he doth not generally forbid all ſinnes to be iudged, neither doth he take from all the power thereof: but onely from thoſe who when they abound with many Crymes, rashly condemne others of euery little Sinne. He ſeemeth alſo to me, to note the Iewes, who being moſt bitter accuſers of their Neighbours for little Sinnes, themſelues neuertheles do not refraine the greateſt crymes. Which alſo our Lord in the end of the Goſpell vpbrayded* (vnto them;) *They bynd heauy burdens and importable, and put them vpon mens ſhoulders, but with a finger of their owne, they will not moue them.*

(1) Hom. 24. in Math.

S. Hierome alledging the ſame wordes, *why ſeeſt thou a moate &c.* ſayth, (2) *He ſpeaketh of thoſe who being guilty themſelues of mortall Crime, do not permit leſſer Sinnes in their Brethren, ſtrayning the gnat, and ſwallowing the Camell: theſe therfore by counterfeiting of Iuſtice are rightly called Hypocrites, who through the beame of their owne eye, do behould the moate in their Brothers eye.*

(2) Ad. c. 7. Math.

(3) Collat. 20. c. 11.

Caſſianus hauing ſpoken of Capital ſinnes, aduiſeth that (3) *From theſe litle ſinnes into which the iuſt man falleth ſeauen tymes,*

as it is written, and ryſeth againe, let repentance neuer be wanting.

Concerning the former different degrees of Anger made by Chriſt our Sauiour, S. Hierome ſayth to Iouinian, (4) *In that thou endeauourest to proue that reproach, and murder, Raca, and Adultery, and idle words and impiety, are to be repayed with one punishment; it is formerly answered, and now I will briefly answere. Either thou wilt deny thy ſelfe to be a ſinner, that thou mayest not be guilty of Hell, or if thou be a ſinner, euen for a litle fault thou art taken to Hell.* (5) *The mouth, ſayth he, which ſlyeth killeth the Soule: I imagine that being a man thou haſt ſometymes lyed, for euery man is a lyar &c. Therfore either thou art no man leſt thou be a lyar, or if thou be a lyar becauſe thou art a man, thou shalt be punished with Parricides & Adulterer, for there is no difference amongſt Sinnes; & they will not thank thee ſo much whome from below thou liftest on high, as they wilbe angry, whome for light and daily Sinnes thou thruſteſt into vtter darkenes.*

(4) *Cont. Iouin. l. 2. c. 17. And ſee. c. 18.*

(5) *Sap. 1. 12.*

The ſame S. Hierome writing vpon theſe wordes of Chriſt, *Thou shalt not go out thence vntill thou pay the laſt farthing*, expoundeth them thus, (6) *This is that which he ſayth, thou shalt not go forth of Priſon, vntill thou shalt pay the leaſt Sinnes*: and the ſame Expoſition is giuen by S. Cyprian, and S. Ambroſe.

(6) *In Matth. 5. 20. Cyp. l. 4. ep. 2. poſt med. Ambr. in Comment. ad c. 12. Lucæ.*

The former wordes of S. Paul are thus expounded by S. Auſtine, (7) *With that tranſitory fyre (whereof the Apoſtle ſaid, he shalbe ſaued, yet ſo as by fyre) not capitall (or deadly) but little ſinnes are purged &c. by which ſinnes though we do not thinke the Soule to be killed, yet they make it deformed &c.* To the ſame purpoſe writeth S. Gregory, (8) *Seeeing Paul affirmeth Chriſt to be the foundation, and addeth, if any shall build &c. he shalbe ſaued, yet ſo as by fyre: Although this may be vnderſtood of Tribulation giuen vs in this lyfe, yet if any vnderſtand it of the fyre of the purging to come, it is carefully to be conſidered, that he whome he affirmeth to be ſaued by fyre, is not he who vpon this foundation buildeth Iron, braſſe, or lead that is, greater Sinnes, and therefore harder, and then vnſatiable: but wood, hay, chaffe, that is, litle and lightest Sinnes, which the fyre may eaſily conſume.*

(7) *Ser. 41. de Sanctis.*

(8) *Dial. l. 4. c. 39.*

(9) *Ho. 14. in Leuit. & ho. 15. in Num. & ho. 2. in Pſ. 38. & ho. 6 in Exod. Baſil. in c. 9. Iſaiæ.*

Agreably hereto ſayth Origen, (9) *we may yet further ad, that the nature of Sinne is like to a matter combuſtible; which S. Paul affirmeth to be built by ſinners, who vpon the foundation of Chriſt, do*

build wood, hay, ſtubble, wherin is manifeſtly diſcouered, that there are ſome ſinnes ſo light, that they are compared to ſtubble, to which indeed as ſoone as fyre is brought, it cannot long continue: and other ſinnes are like to hay, the which are with no great difficulty conſumed by fyre; yet in theſe the fyre abydeth longer then in ſtubble: and laſtly there are other ſinnes which are compared to wood, in which according to the qualitie of the offences, the fyre may fynd long and ſtore of food. So therfore euery ſinne according to the quality and quantity therof, ſhall pay due punishment.

S. Auſtine teacheth vs how to ſatisfye in this life for theſe litle ſinnes, ſaying, (10) *For daily, ſhort, and light ſinnes, without which this life is not paſſed, the dayly prayer of the faithfull doth ſatisfy: for it belongeth to them to ſay, Our Father which art in heauen &c. This prayer doth wholly blot out the leaſt, and daily Sinnes.* Yea he inſtanceth ſome of theſe litle ſinnes, ſaying, (11) *Sometimes we lye for the good of others, a ſinne therfore is it, but veniall.* Alſo he calleth, (12) *Minuta peccata, litle ſinnes,* as often as a man eateth and drinketh more then is neceſſary, or ſpeaketh more then is meete, or is more ſilent then is expedient: with many more ſuch like. In ſo much that Peter Martyr acknowledgeth that, (13) *S. Auſtine in his bookes de Spir. & Lit. c. 28. ſaith, Euen as there are certaine veniall Sinnes, without which euery iuſt man cannot liue, and yet they hinder vs not from Saluation: So are there &c.* Laſtly, by the *foulnes of the feet* wherof our Sauiour ſpake, he vnderſtandeth, (14) *The humane affections without which in this mortality we liue not.* But the Fathers confeſſed Doctrine herof, is more plainly ſeene in their Doctrine of Purgatory.

(10) Enchyr. c 71. And Concil. Tolet. 4. Can 9.

(11) Enchyr. c. 22.

(12) Ser. 41. de Sanct. & Enchyr. c. 78. 79.

(13) Com. plac. part. 3. c. 4. ſect. 81.

(14) In Io. Tract 56 and ſee him ep. 29. ad Hieron.

SECT. IV.

That Proteſtants teach the true difference of Mortall, and Veniall Sinnes.

BVllinger confeſſeth, that when our Sauiour ſpake, as before, of the ſeuerall degrees of Anger, that he thereby expreſſed, (1) *The differences of Sinnes: he alſo by foulnes of the*

(1) Dec. 3. Ser. 10. p. 508.

the ſeete, vnderſtandeth, (2) *The infirmity and imperfection which remayneth after Regeneration.* (3) *We adde* (ſayth Melanchon) *the difference of Sinne, mortall, or raigning, by which Grace is loſt; & of Sinne, not raigning, or veniall.* (4) The Princes & Prot. Eſtates (in their Anſwere to the Emperour penned by Melanchō) affirme that, (5) *Becauſe in the Saints in this lyfe there abyde ſinnes, there muſt be put the difference of thoſe Sinnes, for the which Grace is not left, and of other Sinnes, which do cleane caſt out Grace, and exclude the Holy Ghoſt.*

(1) Dec. 4. Ser. 10. p. 772.
(2) Concil. Theol p. 548.
(4) Acta Concil. Reg. ſp. p. 152.
(5) Ib. p. 185.

The Proteſtant Deuines of Saxony in their publicke Confeſſion teach in like manner, that, (6) *ſeeing it is ſayd, that Sinnes remayne in the Regenerate, it is neceſſary to haue a differences of ſinne deliuered &c. And it is manifeſt, that ſome who are regenerate do grieue, and ſhake of the holy Ghoſt, and are agayne reiected of God, and made ſubiect to the wrath of God, and eternall Punishment &c. Therefore it is neceſſary that thoſe Sinnes which remayne in holy men in this mortal lyfe, and yet do not ſhake of the holy Ghoſt, be diſtinguiſhed from other Sinnes, for the which man is agayne made ſubiect to the wrath of God, and to eternall punishments.* Agayne, (7) *There be alſo other Sinnes in the regenerate, who keep fayth, and a good Conſcience, which do not corrupt the foundation &c. but are the relickes of Originall Sinnes, as darknes, doubting, carnall ſecurity &c.* Agayne, *when we do after this ſort withſtand that corruption, which as yet remayneth in the Regenerate, theſe euils are couered, and it is called Sinne that doth not raygne, or veniall Sinne, and the holy Ghoſt is not ſhaken of. It is euident, that this doctrine concerning the difference of Sinnes, is true, playne, and neceſſary for the Church.*

(6) Harmony of Confeſſ. p. 80.
(7) Ib. p. 81. 82. 190. Maulath loc. com. de diſcrim. pec. mort. et ven. p. 168. 169.

If now there be ſuch difference of Snnes, that in one and the ſame regenerate perſon, ſome ſinnes do ſhake of the holy Ghoſt, and ſome not; whatels then is this, but to affirme, that in one and the ſame man, ſome ſinnes be mortal, and ſome venial?

(8) *Adamus Francisci in Marpur. Theol p. 489. 102.*

Others expreſſely teach that, (8) *Some Sinne of the iuſt is mortall, other venial: it is mortall, whereby fayth is loſt, that ſo they ceaſe to be iuſt: it is veniall, wherewith the Holy Ghoſt and faith can continue:* and the ſame is taught by (9) Bachmanus, who in proofe thereof alledgeth S. Auſtine in Enchyr. c. 71. pro-

(9) Centur. Exercit. Theol Cent. 3. p. 663. 664.

produced in the laſt Section. Iacobus Andræas auoucheth that, (10) *Veniall Sinnes are the falls of humane infirmity*; whereas ſaith he, it is ſaid, (11) *The Iuſt man falleth ſeauen tymes in the day by theſe the holy Ghoſt is not loſt; but mortall ſinnes are abhominations committed againſt the law of God.* Wherin, and ſundry other his ſayings, his meaning is to manifeſt, that Beza doth therfore reproue him ſaying therof, (12) *This difference which Andræas maketh betweene veniall and mortall ſinnes, is vaine.*

(10) Reſp. Bezæ ad Act. Colloq Montisb part. alt. p. 63. 69.
(11) Prou. 24. 16.
(12) Reſp. Bezæ. p. 71. and ſee part. 2. p. 13. 13. 14.

Huſſe alſo acknowledgeth, as Foxe confeſſeth, that ſome ſinnes be (13) *deadly*, others (14) *Veniall, which do not vtterly expell, or put away the habite of vertue.* Huſſe his owne wordes are, *Iohn the Euangeliſt ſometymes ſpeaketh of grieuous or mortall ſinne, as 1. Io. 3. You know that he appeared, that he might take away ſinnes, and ſinne is not in him. Euery one who abydeth in him, ſinneth not, and euery one that ſinneth, ſeeth him not. Behould here he ſpeaketh of grieuous Mortall ſinne, or of Cryme. But there, 1. Io. 1. If we ſhall ſay, that we haue not ſinne, we ſeduce our ſelues, & the truth is not in vs, he ſpeaketh of light ſinne, which is called by vs veniall.*

(13) Act. Mon. p. 220.
(14) Ib.
(15) Ad pſ. 118.

Laſtly M. Iacob a great Preciſian, though in wordes he will not grant veniall ſinne, yet doth he in ſequele of Doctrine cleerly acknowledge the ſame, ſaying, (16) *There are ſinnes againſt the foundation, and there are ſinnes that ſtand with the foundation, wherin men liuing and dying ignorantly, without particular repentance may be ſaued.* But what is this elſe but to ſay, ſome ſinnes are Mortall, and others Veniall?

(16) Defence of the Church and Miniſtery of Engl. p. 88.

SECT. V.

Obiections from Scripture againſt the difference of Mortall and Veniall ſinne, are anſwered.

SOme obiect that, (17) *The ſoule that ſinneth ſhall dye:* And that, (18) *The reward of ſinne is Death:* And that, (19) *He that ſhall breake one of theſe leaſt Commandementes &c. ſhalbe called the leaſt in the kingdome of heauen.* And, (20) *He that offendeth in one, is made guilty of all.* But the former Scriptures which proue

(17) Ezech. 18 20.
(18) Rom. 6. 23
(19) Mat. 5. 20.
(20) Iac. 2. 10.

proue the diuerſity of ſinnes, do ſufficiently explaine theſe and ſuch like, to be vnderſtood, not of that degree of ſinne, which is but conceiued, but of ſinne conſummate, which bringeth forth death: neither of ſuch forſaid ſinne, as maketh vs in daunger but of Iudgment, or Councell, but of that which maketh vs guilty of Hell fyre. Ezechiel ſpeaketh of enormous ſinnes which he there reciteth: S. Paul (21) ſpeaketh of ſuch ſinnes as will not ſtand with Grace and Iuſtice, and the true ſeruice of God: Our Sauiour ſpeaketh not of ſuch as in any reguard breake the Commandement of God, but of the Scribes and Phariſees who by falſe Interpretation depraued the ſame; ſo commēding loue of our Neighbours, as withall commanding hatred of our Enemies; ſo condemning Adultery, as allowing Concupiſcence only in hart conſented vnto. Neither are they here called the *leaſt*, becauſe the Tranſgreſſion therof is inded litle ſinne, but becauſe in reſpect of the other, they are litle, it being a leſſe ſinne to *deſire*, then to *commit Adultery*, and to ſay, *Thou foole*, then to *murther*. S. Iames explicateth himſelfe to ſpeake of great ſinnes, for immediatly he ſaith; *for he that ſaid, Thou ſhalt not commit Adultery, ſaid alſo, Thou ſhalt not kill &c.* Now the reaſon why he ſaith, *He that offendeth in one is made guilty of all*, is giuen by (22) S. Auſtine to be this, *Becauſe all Commandements are reduced to this one of Charity, as S. Paul* (23) *teacheth, from whence it followeth, that who tranſgreſſeth any one Commandement, violateth Charity, and thereby the whole law.* In which (24) he is not vnlike to that man who leauing one part or member of his Body vnarmed, receiueth therin a deadly wound, though the reſt be armed and fenced. Laſtly as S. Iames ſaid, *he that offendeth in one is made guilty of all*, ſo likewiſe he ſaid of himſelfe and other iuſt men, (25) *In many things we offend all.* which doubtles cannot be vnderſtood of damnable ſinnes.

(21) *Rom. 6. 13. 18. 19. 22.*

(22) *Ep. 29. ad Hieron.*

(23) *Rom. 13. 8.*

(24) *Auth. oper. imperf. in Mat. ho 35.*

(25) *C. 3. 2.*

CHAP. XXX.

The true State of the Queſtion, concerning the Authour, and Cauſe of Sinne.

Whether God doth Will, Decree, Predeſtinate, Counſayle, or Compell men to ſinne, or to be damned, or only permitteth the ſame; and that man himſelfe is cauſe of his owne Sinne, and Damnation: And whether Chriſt dyed for all men, or only for the Predeſtinate?

SECT. I.

Catholike Doctrine.

SO blaſphemous and abhominable is the Doctrine of ſundry Proteſtants making God the Author and Cauſe of all ſinnes that men commit, that for an Eternall Condemnation therof the Catholicke Church hath Decreed, that, (1) *If any ſhall ſay, that it is not in mans power to make his wayes euill, but that God worketh aſwell euill deeds as good, not only by permiſsion, but properly and by himſelfe, in ſo much that the treaſon of Iudas is no leſſe his proper worke, then the calling of Paul,* (2) *Anathema.* And, (2) *If any ſhall ſay, that the grace of Iuſtification doth not happen but to thoſe who are Predeſtinate to life: and that all others who are called, are indeed called, but do not receiue grace, as by Gods*

(1) Concil. Trid. Seſſ. 6. Can. 6.

(2) Can. 17.

Gods power being Predeſtinate to euill, Anathema.

In the ſecond Councell Arauſicanum it is defined that, (3) *Men do their owne will, not Gods, when they do that which diſpleaſeth God.* And, (4) *Any to be Predeſtinate to euill by Gods power, we do not only not believe, but if there be any that will believe ſo great an Euill, with all deteſtation we denounce Anathema againſt them.*

(3) Conc. Arauſ. can. 2. cap. 23.
(4) Cap. 25.

In the Councell of Valence it is taught that, (5) *Gods foreknowledge doth not impoſe neceſſity to any that he cannot do otherwiſe: but that which he was to be of his owne will, he, as God, who knoweth all things before they be done, foreknoweth by his owne Omnipotency and immutable Maieſty &c. Neither do therfore euill men periſh, becauſe they could not be good, but becauſe they would not be good, and remayned through their owne fault, in the maſſe of damnation, either by Originall deſert, or alſo actuall.* And, (6) *we confidently confeſſe the Predeſtination of the elect to lyfe, and the Predeſtination of the wicked to death: but in the Election of thoſe that are to be ſaued, the mercy of God did goe before the good deſert, but in the damnation of thoſe that periſh, the euill deſert goeth before the iuſt Iudgment of God &c. But any by Gods power to be Predeſtinate to euill, as though they could not do otherwiſe, we do not only not believe, but if there be any who will believe ſo great an euill, with all deteſtation according to the Councell of Arauſicanum, we denounce Anathema againſt them.*

(5) Conc. Valent. ſub Leone P. 4. Cap. 2.
(6) Cap. 3.

According to theſe Councells the Catholike (7) Church ſtill teacheth, that God doth not Predeſtinate, Command, Counſayle, or Compel men to Sinne, but only permitteth Sinne: the true Cauſes whereof are the Diuell, and Man himſelfe.

(7) Bellar. de amiſ. Gra. & ſtatu Pec. l. 2 c. 8. Rhem. Teſt. in Mat. 23. 15.

Points Diſputable.

Some (8) Schoolmen teach, that Predeſtination formally conſiſteth in the act of Gods vnderſtanding, whereby the Predeſtinate are efficaciouſly ordained to a ſupernaturall end by ſupernaturall meanes. (9) Others place it eſſentially in the act of the Will, whereby the Predeſtinate are choſen by God.

(8) S. Tho. q. 6. de Veritate art. 1. Alex. Halenſ in 1. p. Summæ. q. 28. num 2. art. 1. 2.
(9) Scotus in 1. Diſt. 40. q. vnica. S. Bonauent. 1ad Diſt. art. 1. q. 2.

Some (10) teach, that the effect of Predeſtination is only the meanes whereby the Predeſtinate attayne to beatitude

(10) Durand. 1. Diſt 41. q. 1. n. 10.

titude, but not the attayning of the end it ſelfe. (11) Others teach the direct contrary: And (12) others moſt probably make both the meanes, and the attayning of the end, the effect.

Some (13) though very vntruly, make the meritorious Cauſe of Predeſtination according to all the effects thereof, ſuch good morall workes as go before the Grace of Iuſtification. (14) Others deny this of thoſe morall Workes, but grant it of ſuch as follow Iuſtification. (15) Others deny it of workes following Iuſtification, if they be conſidered as proceeding from the freewill of man, but not as they proceed from the grace of God. (16) But the moſt probable opinion is, that if Predeſtination be conſidered, according to all the effects thereof, there is no meritorious cauſe at all in him that is Predeſtinate, but all is to be referred to the meere Will and Grace of God, though alſo it is moſt true that God ordinarily doth Predeſtinate only thoſe of yeares of diſcretion, whome he forknoweth from all eternity to cooperate with his diuine grace, euen to the end.

Some (17) teach, that in the reprobate, there is not any meritorious cauſe of his reprobation, in reguard of all the effects thereof, to wit, Gods permiſſion of his Sinnes, and his eternall Punithment. (18) Others affirme thoſe ſinnes wherewith a Reprobate departeth out of this lyfe, tobe the meritorious cauſe thereof.

(11) *Occam. 1. Diſt. 41. q. vnica Gabr. 1 Diſt. 40. q. vnica. art 1.*

(12) *Communis Theologorum.*

(13) *Tho. de Argent. in. 1. Diſt. 41. q. vnica. ad. 2.*

(14) *Apud Durand. 1. Diſt. 41 q. 2.*

(15) *Henric. Gandau. quodlib. 4. q. 19. & quodl. 8. q. 5.*

(16) *S. Th. 1. p. q. 23. art. 5. Ala. Halenſ. p. 1. q. 28. mem. 3 art. 3. and others.*

(17) *Magiſt. 1. Diſt. 40. Durand ib. q. 2.*

(18) *S. Bonau. 1. Diſt. 41. art. 1 q. 1. Heruæus 1. Diſt. 40. q. vnica art. 2.*

(19) Way to the true Church Pref. to the Reader. n 12

(20) Def. of the Art. art. 31. p 183.

Proteſtant vntruthes.

D. White demandeth, (19) *Who will beliene that any can be ſo impious that houldeth there is a God, as to make him the Author of Sinne, and yet they shame not to ſay we do it:* Nor it ſeemeth that M. White thameth to deny it, but he ſhall ſee it plainly in the next Paragraph of Proteſtant Doctrine.

M. Rogers writeth (20) *The Sauiour of men is Ieſus Chriſt a man, and came into the world to ſaue no women but men, ſay ſome Papiſtes: And redeemed the ſuperiour world only, which is man, ſaid Poſſellus the Ieſuit: and yet not all men neyther, for S. Francis hath redeemed ſo many as are ſaued ſince his dayes, ſay the Franciſcan Fry-*

ars.

art. The Saviour of women, from her tyme till the end of the world, is S. Clare, affirme some other Papistes: as Possellus sayth, It is one Mother Iane. The Saviour of men and women is S. Mary through her Virginitie, say some; is S. Christina by her Passion, say other Papists &c. Christ hath satisfyed, and was offered only for Originall Sinne, an errour of Thomas Aquinas. Thus lowdly lyeth Rogers: for in this one Sentence, there is not one Propositon, which is not a pure lye, framed by himselfe, in hatred of Catholickes and their Religion,

(21) Iustit. l. 3. c. 23. §. 6.
(22) Ad calc. Colloq. Mont. part. alt. p. 212. 215. 216.
(23) Tom. 2. de Provid. Dei. fol. 365.
(24) Inst. l. 1. c. 4. sect. 3. 4. &c. c. 18. sect. 1. Beza in the Display of Popish Practises. p. 76. Fulk ag. Rh. Test. in c. 6. Mat. sect. 6. & in. 3. ad Ro. sect. 4. & in. 9. ad Ro. sect. 2. & in Art. 28. sect. 2.
(25) 1. Instit. c. 14. §. 3.
(26) De Prou. p. 736.
(27) Ib. p. 738
(28) De Praedest. c. 3. Tom. 7. Col. 193.
(29) Ibid. c. 4. Col. 318.
(30) Part. 2. Thes. p. 107.
(31) Inst. l. 2. c. 17. §. 11. &c. 18 §. 1. de Prou. p. 739. 746. Beza in abst. Calu. Hotm. p. 317. 324.

Protestant Doctrine.

Caluin teacheth, that, (21) *God doth by his Decree ordaine that among men some be borne devoted from their mothers wombe, to certayne perdition, who by their destruction may glorify God.* (22) Beza endeauoureth to answere such cleere Scriptures as teach that Christ dyed for the Sinnes of the whole world. And as concerning our Sinnes, Swinglius teacheth that, (23) *When we commit Adultery or murder, it is the worke of God: God being the worker, the author, and the inciter.* Caluin and Beza maintaine that, our sinnes are not by Gods permission only, but also by his Decree and will. (24) *I haue now* (saith Caluin) *shewed clearly inough, God to be called the Author of all those things, which those censurers will haue only to happen by his idle permission, which are Sinnes:* And, (25) *I do acknowledge this to be my Doctrine; Adam to haue fallen, not only by Gods permission, but also by his secret Counsayle &c.* (26) *Though Adam destroyed himselfe and others, yet it is necessary to ascribe the corruption and guilt to the secret Iudgement of God.* (27) *I confesse I haue written, the fall of Adam to haue been ordayned by the hidden Decree of God.* Zanchius granteth that, (28) *There are not vulgar* (Prot.) *nor vnlearned men, which do easily grant this, that some are Predestinate by the Lord to Sinne.* And (29) *It cannot be denyed, but that some are Predestinated to induration and execration.* This (30) *Doctrine of Predestination* (as Polanus thinketh) *is the foundation, and chiefest part of the Ghospell, to wit,* of Protestants.

Caluin (31) and Beza do in sundry places expressely teach that, *God doth not only permit, but command Sathan to lye & deceyue*

deceyue men. And heereof Beza ſayth, (32) *In this Doctrine is placed the Summe of our Saluation, and comfort.*

Caluin, (33) Beza, and Peter Martyr, do in ſeuerall places defend that, *God doth inforce, and compell men to ſinne, and the Deuill to tempt them.* And of this Doctrine Peter Martyr ſaith, (34) *That we can leſſe vnderſtand, how it doth not fight with Gods Iuſtice to punish ſinnes, and yet by tempting to inforce them to them, it is no meruaile, for God can do more then we vnderſtand.*

Caluin, Beza, and other Prot. teach, that, (35) *God doth neceſſitate and compell men to ſinne:* and yet, *that men ſo neceſſitated ſhalbe damned for the ſame.* Yea (ſaith Caluin) (36) *that I may a hundred tymes confeſſe God to be the Author* (of damnation) *whith is moſt true.* And, (37) *that God electeth ſome, reprobateth others, the cauſe is not elsewhere to be ſought for, then in his intention.* Beza auoucheth that, (38) *God of his meere will, and therfore no reſpect had of worth or indignity, hath predeſtinated to hatred and deſtruction thoſe whom he thought good &c.* This he calleth (39) *The foundation of our faith.* Grinæus and other Prot. teach that, (40) *Sinnes are not the Cauſe that men are damned.* In reguard of the premiſſes Beza is inforced to ſay, (41) *We thinke it a queſtion inexplicable to mans ſenſe, how God is not in fault, if he ordaine the Cauſes of Damnation.* And let all Prot. who believe this Doctrine, tremble to thinke in what miſerable caſe they are, ſeeing D. Whitaker ſaith, (42) *If Caluin, Peter Martyr, Melanchton, or Luther, or any of ours affirme God to be the Author of ſinne, I will not deny, but that we are all guilty of horrible blaſphemy and wickednes.* A large and deſperate offer.

(32) Ib. p. 318.
(33) Inſt. l. 1. c. 18. § 4. & de Prædeſt. p. 717. Beza de Prædeſt. cont. Caſt. p. 401. Pet. Mart. in c. 9. Rom. p. 303. & in c. 11. p. 317.
(34) In loc. claſſ. 1. c. 15 § 9.
(35) Inſt. l. 3. c. 23 § 9. Beza de Prædeſt. p. 391. Zwingl. de Prouid. c. 6. fol. 366.
(36) Inſt. l. 3. c. 23. § 8.
(37) In Rom. c. 11.
(38) De Pred. vol. 3. Theol. p. 418.
(39) Ib. p. 408.
(40) Apud Schluſſelb. l. 4. Theol. Calu. Art. 8. p. 76.
(41) De Prædeſt. cons. Caſtal. p. 340.
(42) Cont. Camp. rat. 8. p. 215.
(43) L. Cont. Hær. poſt med.
(44) Ad Articulos ſibi falsò impoſitos, art. 10.
(45) Hær. 66.

And

And the like doth (46) S. Irenæus, & Tertullian in Marcion.

There were alſo certain (47) Heretickes called *Predeſtinates*, who taught that neither good deeds would profit the good, nor euill deeds hurt the wicked, but that all things depended only of Gods abſolute Predeſtination, or Reprobation; wherupon they averted the good from doing good deeds, and incited the bad to do worſe. Yea it is related amongſt the (48) Errours of *Mahomet*, that he taught God to be the Author of all euill.

(46) L. 3. c. 29. Tertul. cont. Marcion. l. 2. c. 2.

(47) Prateolus, verbo Predeſtinati. Genebrard in Sozimo. Sigebert Anno 413. Baron. Anno 490. n. 17.

(48) Sand. hiſt. 223. 228

Proteſtant Errours.

No Errour can be more groſſe and impious, then the Proteſtant Doctrine related before; only adde herunto the great crime that Danæus imputeth to Bellarmine, ſaying, (49) *Bellarmine ſaith, Chriſt is predeſtinate the Sonne of God, which is Arrianiſme.* And the ſame is taught by (50) Affelmannus.

Cedreno in Heraclio.

(49) Contron. 1. queſt. 14. p. 30.

(50) L. 2. de Prædeſt. §. 70.

SECT. II.

It is proued by Scriptures, that God doth not Predeſtinate, will, Decree, Counſaile, or compell men to ſinne, or to be damned, but only permitteth the ſame: And that Chriſt dyed not only for the Predeſtinate, but for all men whatſoeuer.

TO confute theſe blaſphemies by the ſacred Scriptures, they teach vs that god willeth not ſinne, or the death of a ſinner, but that he conuert and liue; as alſo that he hateth and forbiddeth ſinne. (1) *I will not the death of him that dyeth, ſaith our Lord, returne ye and liue.* (2) *I will not the death of the impious, but that the impius conuert from his way, and liue. Conuert conuert yee from your moſt euill waies.* And, *why will you dye ô houſe of Iſrael?* (3) *Iudge betweene me and my vineyard, what is there that I ought to do more to my vineyard & haue not done to it? when I looked that it ſhould yield grapes, and it hath yielded wild grapes?* Thou (4) *art not a God that willeth iniquitie.* Becauſe theſe words, (5) *Thou art not a God that wilt iniquity*, do proue that God doth

(1) Ezech 18. 32.

(2) ib. c. 33. 11.

(3) Iſa. 5. 3. 4.

(4) Pſ. 5. 5.

(5) Pſ. 5. 5.

not will ſinne, therfore the (6) Geneuians inſteed herof do tranſlate, *Thou doſt not loue iniquity.* And, *Thou* (7) *doſt not delight in iniquity*, that ſo they may defend their Errour, that God willeth iniquity for ſome end; although he neither loue it, nor delight in it. And the ſame corruption is made by (8) Tremellius and (9) Piſcator. (*) *Thou hateſt all them that worke iniquity* (10) *The wicked man and his wickednes are hateſull to God.* (11) *He hath commanded no man to do vngodly.* (12) *Let no man when he is tempted ſay, that he is tempted of God; for God is not a tempter of euills, and he tempteth no man.* Theſe textes are moſt cleere to proue, that God doth not will, command, or tempt men to ſinne, but wiſheth their Conuerſion and hateth ſinne.

(6) *Anno* 1508.
(7) *Anno* 1588.1610.
(8) *In ſua verſione lat. Anno* 1603.
(9) *Apud Vorſtium in Paraſceue.c.3.*
(*) *Pſ* 5.7.
(10) *Sap.* 14. 9.
(11) *Eccleſ.* 15.21. *And ſee Ierem.*19. 5.
(12) *Iac.*1. 13. *Eccl.*15.21. 22.

Becauſe theſe words of Ezechiel, (13) *I will not the death of a ſinner, but that he conuert from his way and liue*, do proue that God willeth not the death of a ſinner, Muſculus inſteed therof tranſlateth thus, (14) *I do not delight in the death of a ſinner*; and the ſame is vſed by (15) Tremellius and Piſcator, (16) that ſo God may be thought to will the death of a Sinner, though he do not delight therin. Other places attribute ſinne and damnation to our ſelues, and all our goodnes to God, (17) *Perdition is thyne ô Iſrael, only in me is thy help.* (18) *When he ſpeaketh a lye, he ſpeaketh of his owne, becauſe he is a lyar and the Father therof.* (19) *He that committeth ſinne is of the Deuill &c. For this appeared the ſonne of God, that he might diſſolue the workes of the Deuill.* So that by theſe places it appeareth that ſinne proceedeth not from God, but from the Deuill & the ſinner himſelfe.

(13) *Ezech.*33. 11.
(14) *In loc. tit. de veritate Dei. p.* 452.
(15) *In hunc locum.*
(16) *In Theſſ.l.*2.*p.* 287.
(17) *Oſe.*13. 8. *Ezech.*14. 29. *Iſa* 65. 12. *Prou.*1. 24. *Mat.* 23. 37.
(18) *Io.*8. 44.
(19) 1.Io.3.8.

All ſuch places as conuince that Chriſt would haue all ſaued, and dyed for all, confirme the ſame, (20) *God will all men to be ſaued, and to come to the knowledge of the truth, who gaue himſelfe a Redemption for all*; (21) *who tooke away the ſinnes of the world. Who was* (22) *the reconciliation for our ſinnes, and not for ours only, but alſo for the ſinnes of the whole world*, and ſundry (23) ſuch like.

(20) 1. Tim. 2.4.6.

To theſe places Prot. anſwere, That they are only vnderſtood of the Elect, and not of all in generall. Beza, (24) *It is cleere that Peter ſpeaketh only to the faythfull.* Zanchius, (25)

It

It is only vnderſtood of the Elect. (26) Bucer, *It is vnderſtood of them only whom he hath choſen to this purpoſe, that they may be converted and liue:* ſo reſtrayning vniuerſall Propoſitions to particulars; which herin they do ſo vniuſtly, that Iacobus Andræas (27) in diſlike therof ſaith, *This ſentence of Peter is ſo plaine, that it can by no meanes admitte this falſe interpretation.* Yea, (28) *it is manifeſt impiety and abhominable doctrine, againſt the expreſſe letter of a Promiſe vniuerſall, to make a particuler.* And, (29) *It is horrible to be heard, ſo plaine and vniuerſall vocation, to deuiſe to be particuler.* Agreable alſo ſaith Gerlachius, (30) *Whenſoeuer in Scripture there is an vniuerſall propoſition, it is to be limited by no diſtinction, vnles the ſame be grounded vpon certaine and cleere words of Scripture, otherwiſe euery doctrine may be ſhifted of with the ſubtility of diſtinctions.* So litle helpeth this Euaſion, euen in the Iudgement of Proteſtants.

Yea the Scriptures teach that Chriſt dyed euen for the reprobate, & thoſe that are damned: (31) *We hope in the liuing God, which is the Sauiour of all men, eſpecially of the faythfull.* (32) *In you there ſhallbe lying Maiſters, which ſhall &c. deny him that hath bought them, the Lord: bringing vpon themſelues ſpeedy perdition:* (33) *through thy knowledge ſhall thy weake brother periſh for whome Chriſt hath dyed?* (34) *How much more thinke you doth he deſerue worſe punishment, which hath troden the Sonne of God vnder foote, and eſteemed the Bloud of the Teſtament polluted, wherin he is ſanctifyed.* Here the wicked man, who, as Prot. affirme, (35) *committeth ſinne againſt the holy Ghoſt*, being therfore a reprobate, is yet ſaid *to be ſanctifyed in the Bloud of Chriſt*, which could not be, vnles it had bene ſhed for him. Here Prot. are inforced to corrupt the Scriptures: for becauſe theſe wordes, (36) *Who is the Sauiour of all men, eſpecially the faithfull*, do ſhew Chriſt to haue redeemed all men, Beza (37) inſteed of *Sauiour*, placeth a *Preſeruer*. ſaying, *Becauſe the name of Sauiour hath troubled ſome, in reguard that it ſomwhat fauoureth life eternall to be gayned in Chriſt, therfore that I might eſchew the doubtfull ſignification of the word, I rather call him, Preſeruer.* Wherin Tremellius alſo followeth him.

(12) 2. Io. 2. 10.
(12) 1. Io. 2. 2.
(23) 2. Cor. 5. 15. Rom. 8. 32. Heb. 2. 9. Io. 4. 42. 2. Pet 3. 9. Apoc. 3. 20. Iſa. 1. 3. 4. Ezech. 18. 32. 33. 11.
(24) In Colloq. Montisbel. p. 442. & part. 2. reſp. ad acta illius colloq. p. 232.
(11) L. 5 de Nat. Dei. c. 2. col. 564.
(26) In Mat. 6. p. 169.
(17) In Mat. 6. p. 169.
(27) In colloq. Montisbel. p. 422.
(28) In Colloq Montisbel. p. 419.
(29) P. 422.
(30) Tom. 2. Diſp. 24.
(31) 1. Tim. 4. 10.
(11) 2. Pet. 2. 1.
(32) 2. Cor. 8. 11 Rom. 14. 15.

(34) Heb. 10. 29. (35) See the Marg. notes of the Engl. Bible of Anno 1576. in Heb. 10. 29. (36) 1. Tim. 4. 10. (37) Ibid.

Beza (38) and ſundry other Prot. in anſwere to all the former places do affirme and teach, *A double will in God; the one ſecret, fearfull, and vnſearchable; the other, the reuealed will of God in his word.* Affirming hereupon that, *he will not the death of a Sinner in his will reuealed in his word, but willeth it by his vnſearchable will.* But if God would not the death of a ſinner by his will reuealed in his word, why then do Prot. vrge from his ſaid word, that he willeth the death of a Sinner, as of Eſau, Pharao &c. And if that other vnknowne will be not reuealed in the Scriptures, from whence then haue they knowledge of ſuch a will in God, vnles it be from their owne vaine imaginations? Beſides, if God by his forſaid reuealed will, would ſeriouſly and in truth the Converſion and Saluation of a ſinner, and yet by his forſaid ſecret will, would it not; then he doth plainly will contraries, which to thinke, were abſurd. And if to auoyd this contrariety in God, Proteſtantes only meane, that by his ſaid reuealed will, he would not ſeriouſly & indeed the ſaluation of the ſaid ſinner, but only maketh outward ſhew by promiſe in word, as though he willed the ſame: this then were his reuealed diſſimulation, rather then his reuealed will, which to ſay were blaſphemous: ſo inſufficient euery way is this anſwere, either to ſatisfy the former plaineſt textes of Scripture, or to vphould this ſo impious doctrine of the Caluiniſtes.

But becauſe ſome (39) demaund, why all are not ſaued, if God would haue them ſo indeed, ſeeing, (40) *He doth whatſoeuer he will?* I anſwere with ſundry (41) Prot. that God willeth ſome things abſolutely, and thoſe do euermore accordingly come to paſſe; other things he willeth both ſeriouſly and truly, and yet but conditionally, if we our ſelues will, as our Converſion, Repentance, and the like: ſo it is ſayd, (42) *The wicked man ſhall liue, if he will turne from his wayes.* And (43) *If any man will heare my voyce, and open the gate, I will come into him.* In theſe things God doth not inforce our willes, but giueth vs condition of (44) *Choyce*, as (45) not *ſuffering vs to be tempted aboue our power*: And therefore though theſe things come not alwayes to paſſe anſwerably to Gods foreſaid

(38) Diſplay of Popiſh Practiſes. p. 186. 190. 191. & in colloq. Montiab p. 1. p. 182. 183. & part. 2. p. 173. Danæus Iſagog. part. 4. l. 3. c. 18. p. 104. Kinnedoncius in his redempt. of mank. p 170. 182. Willet. Synop. p. 716. Luther de ſer. Arb. Tom. 2. f. 450.

(39) Kinnedon. in his redempt. of mank. p. 181.

(40) *Pſ.* 113.

(41) *Eliper. Meth. Theol. l. 2. p. 156. Bouſcul. loc. com. de volunt. Dei. p. 415. Piſcat. Vol. Theſ. Theol. p. 174. Heming. de vniuerſ. grat. p. 10. Mandus Polanus partition. Theol. l. 2. p. 10. 12.*

(42) *Ezech.* 18. 21. 23. & 33. 11. 19. (43) *Apoc.* 3. 20. (44) *Deut.* 30. 19. *Eccleſ.* 15. 17. (45) 1. *Cor.* 10. 13.

ſaid will, the cauſe thereof yet is through want, not of Gods will, but of our owne will not aſſenting to his: which our default, contray to Gods forſayd Conditionall will, himſelfe plainly yet further ſignifyeth, as where it is ſaid, (46) *I would cleanſe thee, and thou art not cleanſed from thy filthines, but* (47) *wouldeſt not* (48) *I called & you refuſed.* (49) *I called & you haue not anſwered: I ſpake. & you haue not heard &c. and you haue choſen the things that I would not.* And to Hieruſalem, (50) *How often would I &c. and you would not.* And hence it is, that the wicked are ſayd to (51) *reſiſt the holy Ghoſt*: So cleerely are we taught by the ſacred Scriptures, that God doth not decree or will the Sinne or damnation of men, but that he deſireth their Saluation, and dyed for all men.

(46) *Ezech.* 24.13.
(47) Marg. notes of the Eng. Bibles, in Ezech. 24.13.
(48) *Prou.* 1. 24.
(49) *Iſa* 65. 12.
(50) *Mat.* 23. 37.
(51) *Act.* 7. 51.

SECT. III.

That the Fathers expound the Scriptures in proofe that God doth not will or command Sinne: And that Christ dyed for all.

THe Ancient Fathers were ſo carefull and zealous in cleering God from being the Cauſe or Authour of ſin, that S. (1) Irenæus writ a whole worke againſt that Hereſy; S. Baſill a whole Oration; Theodoret (2) confirmeth the ſame at large with the teſtimonies of Plato, and other Philoſophers; S. Auſtine writ three books of freewill, chiefly to proue, that God is not the cauſe of Sinne: and S. (3) Fulgentius in a whole booke diſputeth this queſtion, *whether ſinner be ſtirr'd by Gods Predeſtination*, which is the ſelfeſame we argue now with Prot. and he concludeth with vs negatiuely.

(1) *Euſeb. l. 5. hiſt c. 19.*
(2) *Ser. 5. ad Gratos.*
(3) *L. 1. ad Monimum.*

S. Cyprian affirmeth that, (4) *Seeing it is written* (5) *God made not Death, neither doth he reioyce in the perdition of the liuing, that he that would haue no man perish, deſireth ſinners to do Penaunce &c. euill deeds come not from the holy Ghoſt, but from the inſtinct of the aduerſary* &c. (6) *It is abſurd* (ſaith S. Epiphanius) *to aſcribe malice to God, and the Character of diuine and Eccleſiaſticall Scripture doth confeſſe, that God is farre &c. from Euill. For God made nothing euill, but all things very good as being good by nature &c. neither therfore was euill alwaies, nor was it made by God.*

(4) *L. 4. Ep. 2.*
(5) *Sap. 1. 13.*
(6) *Har. 66. quæ eſt Melich. propinit.*

S. Am-

S. Ambroſe demandeth, (7) *how God can beget malice, ſeeing the Prophet crieth, Ceaſe from your malice? and eſpecially S. Dauid ſayth, Ceaſe from euill, and do good: How therefore do we make our Lord the beginner thereof? But this brutiſh opinion is theirs, who would haue the Church troubled.*

(7) *L. 1. Examer. c. 8.*

S. Hierome expounding thoſe words of the Apoſtle, *Who made all things according to the Counſaile of his will*, ſaith, (8) *Not that all things which are done in the world, are done by his will & Counſaile, for then euils (or ſinnes) ſhould be imputed to him; but that all things which he doth, he doth by Counſaile, and will.* In like ſort vpon thoſe words, *God created man right*, he (9) writeth, *Leſt he ſhould ſeeme to make God the Author of Euill, he wiſely forwarned, and affirmeth, that we are created good by God, but becauſe we are left with freewill, by our owne fault we fly de to worſe.*

(8) *Comment. in c. 1. ad Epheſ.*

(9) *Comment. in Eccl. c. 7.*

S. Auſtine auoucheth that, (10) *We no where read there is no will (or deſire) but from God, and it is well not to be written, becauſe it is not true; for otherwiſe God is the Author of ſinnes, which God forbid.* And in another place, (11) *I do not fynd at all neither that it can be found, nor indeed is, I do confirme, how our Sinnes can be aſcribed to our God, when as in them I fynd him prayſworthy, not only becauſe he punisheth them, but alſo, that they are then done, when his truth is left.* Yea yet further, (12) *It is a hateſull and abhominable opinion to believe, that God is the Author of any ill will, or Action.*

(10) *De ſpir. & lit. c. 31.*

(11) *De lib. arb. l. 3. c. 16.*

(12) *Ad Art. ſibi falsò impoſ. Art. 20.*

Of the Fathers beliefe in this point Caluin ſaith: (13) *The Ancient Fathers were ſometimes ouer religiouſly fearfull to confeſſe the truth in this matter &c. not Auſtine was free ſometimes from that ſuperſtition, as where he ſaith, That induration and execration pertaine not to the workings of God, but to his foreknowledge.* If Prot. had that religious feare which they reproue in the Fathers, they would not ſo execrably blaſpheme, making God the Author of ſinne.

(13) *In Hit. l. 2. c. 4 ſect. 3.*

SECT.

SECT. IV.

That Proteſtant writers do teach the ſame doctrine with Catholickes, againſt God being the author of ſinne, or Damnation.

MAny of the learnedſt Prot. both Lutherans and Caluiniſtes do ioyne with vs in this Doctrine againſt Caluin and Beza; A thing ſo euident, that Perkins wrote a ſpeciall Treatiſe, (1) *Vt criminationes &c. that he might do away the blame impoſed vpon the truth*: or ſaith he, *as they call it, the Caluinian Doctrine, and appeaſe the diſpleaſed minds of certaine brethren.* Willet alſo confeſſeth and diſliketh that, (2) *Vniuerſality of Grace ſeemeth to be much approued euen of ſome of our owne Country men, and hath already gotten ſome Patron in our Church*: the Doctrine wherof was preached by D. Harſnet at Paules. Couell teacheth that, (3) *God hath a generall inclination to ſaue all.* And that (4) *with a Conditionall will he willeth all men to be ſaued, who therfore that they are not, is not his Decree, but their owne fault.* Sutcliffe chargeth Cartwright (5) *with blaſphemy*, for that he ſaid, *that God doth blaſt mens pens with a lying ſpirit, attributing the wicked action to God.* Nappier teacheth that, (6) *Temptation and euill is only from the permiſſion of God.* Foxe ſaith, (7) *Seeing the benefite of Redemption, which taketh away the ſinnes of the world, is an vniuerſall thing; it is demanded whether the Grace of this Redemption do appertaine equally to all the Poſterity of Adam, or be reſtrained to a certaine number? I anſwere*, ſaith he, *that the incredulity of men, and no default of the Lambe maketh this reſtraint: which reſtraint*, ſaith he, *commeth to paſſe, not through any defect of the Redeemer, but through the fault of men, who receiue not the Grace of Redemption.* Yea this Doctrine of Reprobation taught by ſome Prot. is according to Kinnedoncius, (8) *Satanicall Franticke*; to Melanchton, (9) *Hurtfull to manners*; to Chriſtmanus (10) *wicked*; to Rungius (11) *Blaſphemous*; to Andræas (12) *a horrible doctrine.*

(1) *De Prædeſtinationis modo & ordine Ep. ad Lect.*
(2) *Synop. p. 784. 808.*
(3) *Def. of Hook. p. 82.*
(4) *Ibid. p. 62. 63.*
(5) *Examinat. of Cartwright. Apol. fol. 19.*
(6) *Vpon Reuel. c. 13. p. 190.*
(7) *In Apoc. p. 471.*
(8) *Redempt. of mank. l. 2. c. 11. p. 31.*
(9) *Loc. com. de cauſa pec. & conting. Theſ 10.*

(10) *Diagraphe Electi nis p. 94.* (11) *Diſp. 25. ex Ep. Pauli &c. diſp. 24.* (12) *Epit. Colloq. Mompelg. p. 34.*

Beza is for his contrary Doctrine publickly reprehended by Andræas, (13) & Haffenrefferus: And Caluin, Beza and Zanchius are reproued by (14) Schluſſelburge. And Caluin by Geſnerus, (15) Lobechius, (16) and Haffenrefferus. (17) Alſo Hemingius, (18) Hiperius, (19) Manlius, (20) Chemnitius, (21) and Brachmanus (22) do alleadge many Scriptures to proue, that God doth not ordaine any man to damnation, but that he would all men ſaued, and that he dyed for all.

Paræus affirmeth, that, (23) *The Cauſe of poſitiue reprobation is the wickednes of the reprobate, becauſe as God doth punish no man in tyme but only for ſinnes, ſo alſo he hath decreed from eternity to punish no man.*

Snecanus (though otherwiſe a great (25) *admirer and follower* of Caluin and Beza) is neuertheles ſo full and (25) euident, that Willet reprehendeth him, calling him therfore, (26) *A Patrone of vniuerſall Grace.* Bullinger teacheth in like manner that, (27) *The Lord hath dyed for all, but that all men are not made partakers of this Redemption, is through their owne fault, for the Lord excludeth no man.* And of the like Iudgement is (28) Adamus Franciſci alledging many Scriptures in proofe of his opinion.

M. Hooker is ſo plaine in affirming that, (29) *Gods generall inclination is, that all men might be ſaued*, that he is therefore ſpecially reproued by the (30) Puritanes. M. Gibbens maketh a ſpeciall diſcourſe heereof, affirming that (31) *Surely there was no cauſe in God eyther in his will, or in his knowledge or Decree, that man ſhould fall.* And that, (32) *God willeth or decreeth things that are euill, not to do, or cauſe them to be done, or will them, but permit, or ſuffer them &c. God only willing to permit them.* And the ſame is taught by Amandus (33) Polanus, and the Centuriſts.

Melanct'hon and others do alledge Scriptures to proue that,

(11) *In reſp. Bezæ ad acta Colleq. Montisb p. 151.*
(14) *Theol. Calu. l. 2. art. 12. fol 39. 40. 41.*
(15) *Diſp. pro ſancto. lib. concor. diſp. 3. c. 3. p. 60. 61. 62.*
(16) *Diſp. Theol. diſp. 2. p. 14. & diſp. 21. p. 507. 508 509.*
(17) *Loc. Theol. l 3. p. 112. 188.*
(18) *Enchir. &c. claſſ. 3. p. 220. 221. 222.*
(19) *Meth. Theol. l. 2. p. 431. 435. 436. 438.*
(20) *Loc. com. p. 104.*
(21) *Ecchyrid p. 158.*
(22) *Cens. exercit. Theo. q. 213 p 316. q. 24. p. 119.*
(23) *In Col. log. Theol. diſp. 13.* (24) *Meth. diſcript. p. 410.* (25) *Ib. p. 181. 515. 649.* (26) *Synop. p. 1. 739. 801.* (27) *Vpon the Epiſt. ſer. 28 f. 72.* (28) *Marg. vita Theol. pag. 277. 281. 283. 296. 298.* (29) *Eccl. Pol. l. 1. c. 4.* (30) *Chriſtian letter to Hook. p. 16.* (31) *Queſtions vpon Gen. q 2. p. 108.* (32) *Ib. pag. 109. 110.* (33) *Partit. Theol. l. 2. p. 75. 76. & 10. 11. 12. Cens. l. 1. 2. c. 4. Col. 348.*

that, (34) *God willeth not our Sinne: and that Pharaos hart was hardned by Gods permiſsion, not by his will.* And Melanchton ſayth concerning Saul, (35) *God foreſaw the ſinnes of Saul, but he willed them not, neyther doth he force his will, but permitteth, that the will of Saul may ſo rage, and he doth not force that he do otherwiſe.* And many texts of Scripture are alledged to the ſame end by (36) Sarcerius, Snecanus, and Bullinger. Yea Willet himſelfe affirmeth that, (37) *God decreeth not, but only foreſeeth ſinfull workes: and that* (38) *God foreſeeth, but willeth not Sinne.*

Chriſtmanus hath publiſhed a whole (39) Booke of this matter directly againſt Caluin, and other Prot. that ioyne with him; wherin the title of the eight Chapter is, *De Caluinianorum abſoluto decreto.* Of the ninth Chapter, *De obiectionum pro abſoluto Decreto refutatione.* And of the tenth, *Rationes immota contra Caluinianorum abſolutum Decretum, & quòd Deus vult omnes homines ſaluos fieri.*

Hemingius hath written a ſpeciall (40) Treatiſe of this Argument, for which Willet (41) reprehendeth him, for that therin he *teacheth that it is in mans power to give aſſent to grace offered, and to believe.* And himſelfe auoucheth that, *Caluins* (42) *opinion fighteth with the word of God, calling and inuiting all to repentance &c.* And, *that many are brought into deſpaire, whileſt with that opinion the Doctrine of vniverſall grace is overthrowne.* Yea (43) he chargeth his Brethren with ten ſeverall *Errours* in this matter, all which he doth there particularly ſet downe.

Marbachius alſo hath written a Treatiſe, the title whereof is, *Diſputatio Theologica de vniverſali Dei voluntate erga totum genus humanum, adverſus eos qui ad ſolos Electos & Credentes eam reſtringere conantur.* Conradus Schluſſelburg affirmeth that, (44) *The Divinity of Caluiniſtes teacheth Chriſt to have dyed only for the Elect:* Yea, *he affirmeth that the merit of Chriſt cannot be oppoſed to the Iudgment of God &c. Are not theſe Reuelations vpon the Reuelation, as D. Luther was accuſtomed to ſay of new and obſcure wormes, and tryfles of Fanaticall men &c. The wordes of Iohn the Apoſtle are cleere inough, for he hath ſaid Chriſt to have dyed not only for the ſinnes of the Apoſtles, and the Elect, but he addeth, to have ſatisfyed for the ſinnes of the whole world.*

In briefe, Caſtalio (45) writeth herin againſt Caluin, and

(14) *Loc. com. de cauſa pec. & conſtitut. & in Confeſſ. Theol. part. 2 p. 111. Keckerman. in Syſtem. Theol. p. 101. Braſb. Cent Exerc.*
(15) *Loc. com. c. de cauſa peccati.*
(16) *Loc. com. Tom. 2. de Prædeſt.*
f 31. 32. 79. 80. *Snecan. Meth. deſcript. p. 622. & c. Bulling. in Dec. in Engl. p. 492.*
(37) *Synop. p.* 789. 799.
(38) *Ib. p. 809.*
(39) *Diagraphe Electionis &c.*
(40) *De gratia vniverſali &c.*
(41) *Synop. p. 784.*
(42) *De Grat. vniuerſ. p. 111.*
(43) *Ib p. 771.*
(44) *Theol. Calu. l. 1. c. 6. de redempt.*

Christi.

and Andræas (46) against Beza: and after many Scriptures alleadged against Beza's forsaid doctrine, he concludeth that it is, (47) *Horrendum auditu, fearfull to be heard.* Yea the Prot (48) Magistrates of Berna made it penall for any of their Territory to preach Caluins forsaid doctrine, or for the people to read any of his Bookes contayning the forsaid doctrine. And yet such is the inconstancy of Caluin, as that sometimes he affirmeth, that, (49) *This common opinion of the Schooles is true, Christ suffered sufficiently for the whole world, but efficaciously for the Elect alone.*

(45) L. ad Caluin. de Prædest.

(46) Epistom. Colloq. Montisb. p. 49. 53.

(47) Ib p. 47.

(48) See the letters Senatus Bernensis ad Ministros &c. Anno 1555.

(49) In 1. Ioan. c. 2.

SECT. V.

Reasons to prone that God doth not will, command, or inforce men to Sinne, or to be damned, but that he only permitteth the same.

1. WHosoeuer doth Command or inforce a man to do any thing, is the Principall Author of the same thing, and is so reputed by all, neither doth the naturall light of reason suffer vs to deny it. Besides the wicked man when he sinneth (according to Prot.) is the Instrument of God, but he that vseth the Instrument is the Principall author of that worke, which is wrought by the Instrument. Ergo.

Some answere heerto, that though God command or inforce men to sinne, yet the said sinnes, are not sinnes, as they proceed from God so inforcing, but as they proceed from the wicked mind and wicked intention of man: In so much that God in those actions doth propose to himselfe a good (1) end, to wit, the manifestation of his mercy and Iustice, by shewing mercy to some, and condemning others, wheras man doth propose his owne lust or pleasure. But this doth not satisfye, for first it is not lawfull to (2) do euill, that there may come good; as to steale, for to giue Almes, or to commit fornication, to beget Children. Besides I would know, whether the euill intention of man, which causeth it to be sinne in man, is commanded and forcibly caused by God

(1) Calus Inst. l. 1. c. 17. §. 5. Swing. loc. de Prom. c. 6.

(2) Rom. 3. 8.

God or no. If it be, then is God plainly the author of ſinne, that euill Intention being it, which cauſeth the action to be euill, and to be ſinne. And that he is this Author, according to them it is euident, for ſinne is not ſinne (as they teach) but by reaſon of the euill Intention, wherfore if he force them to ſinne, he forceth them to the euill Intention. And if God to ſhew his mercy and Iuſtice decreed from all Eternity, that man ſhould ſinne, and ſinne is not ſinne except it be done with euill Intention, it followeth cleerly, that God decreed that man ſhould worke with euill intention. And becauſe the Decree of God cannot be vncertaine, not depending of the freewill of man, it further followeth, that God did forcibly procure, that man ſhould worke with euill intention, and ſo be no leſſe Author of the Euill Intention, then of the worke it ſelfe.

Others ſeeke to euade by affirming, that, God doth not will ſinne in that formall reſpect as it is Sinne, but for ſome other end: But ſo neither the Deuils themſelues do will ſinne, for as ſo, it is a meere priuation of Good, wheras the reaſon or obiect of willing, muſt needs be in ſome reſpect good.

Aretius further replyeth ſaying, (3) *We anſwere, God hauing no Superiour, can haue no Law preſcribed him, and ſinne hath only place, where there is a Law; and that hence it followeth, that in the Actions of God there is no ſinne:* And ſo in the ſame worke the will of man tranſgreſſeth the law, and is euill, and the will of God tranſgreſſeth not the law, and is not euill. But though God hath no law impoſed vpon him by any Superiour, yet his wiſdome and nature is as a law vnto him, wherfore no leſſe is he bound not to impugne his owne wiſdome, then man Gods law: And ſo if God ſhould force men to commit thoſe things which are contrary to his Eternall law, and ſo to his diuine wiſdome, as to commit adultery &c. then ſhould his will be euill, being contrary to the right rule of his diuine wiſdome, which were God to deny himſelfe, which is impoſſible. Againe, if God command a man to ſinne, man is bound to obey his Command, and ſo a man committing Adultery, ſinneth againſt one of his

(3) *Loc. Com. p. 130. & Zwingl. loc. de Prouid. c. 6.*

Commandementes, & ſinneth not in executing Gods will and Decree, and ſo God inforcing him, will haue him to ſinne, and will not haue him to ſinne. Laſtly, though God hauing no Superiour can haue no law impoſed vpon him, other then his owne wiſdome, and ſo thereby cleered from ſinne in himſelfe, yet this auayleth nothing to cleere him from being the author and cauſe of ſinne in vs, which is the only point here in queſtion. Adde yet herunto, what an impiety it is to teach, that God damneth men for doing thoſe things, which himſelfe commandeth and compelleth them to do.

2. If God doth intend, decree, command, and compell men to ſinne, it further followeth, that he is not only the Author and cauſe of ſinne in vs, but that he himſelfe truly ſinneth, which is extreme blaſphemy to auouch: for therfore are men ſaid to ſinne, becauſe they are free and particular cauſes of ſuch actions, as are contrary to reaſon, & the Eternall law of God: But according to Prot. God concurreth to the forſaid actions, not only as an vniuerſall cauſe (as Catholickes teach) but euen according to Caluin, (4) as a particular Cauſe, willing, & commanding them as they are ſuch in particular, which is nothing elſe but truly and properly to ſinne. Yea (5) Beza teacheth, that God doth not only moue and compell his Inſtruments to ſuch actions, which in reguard of the Inſtruments are ſinne, but alſo that he createth the ſaid Inſtruments, that is, men to that end, that they ſhould performe thoſe actions which he intended and decreed from all Eternity: whereof it neceſſary followeth, that the ſaid euill actions, as they are ſuch in particuler, were intended by God, and ſo to be attributed to him as the principall cauſe, and ſo conſequently, that he truly and properly ſinneth: This neceſſary Conſequence inforced Beza to ſay, (6) *We thinke it a queſtion inexplicable to mans ſenſes, how God is not in fault, if he ordayne the Cauſe of damnation.*

(4) Inſtit. l. 2. c. 4. ſ. 2.

(5) In Aphoriſm. 22.

(6) De Prædeſt. cont. Caſtal. p. 160.

Caluin (7) would euade by affirming, that as the ſunne doth cauſe in a dead Carcaſe noyſome ſmels, and yet the beames therof contract no impurity, ſo may God be cauſe of ſinne in vs, & yet not ſinne himſelfe. But this is many wayes imper-

(7) Inſtit. l. 1. c. 17. ſ. 5.

impertinent; for firſt before all concourſe of the ſunne, it is ſuppoſed, that the Body is already dead & diſpoſed to corruption, for in a ſound body the ſunne beames cannot produce any ſuch effect: but according to Prot. God moued Adam & Sathan to ſinne, when they were in perfect and innocent ſtate. Secondly the ſunne is only an vniuerſall cauſe, which intendeth not corruption, but heate, which heate of it ſelfe is indifferent to produce different Effects, and is limited and determined by ſecondary and particular cauſes to produce rather one effect then another, as might be exemplifyed in an Apple, or perfume, and a dead Carcaſe, wheras according to them, God concurreth particularly, intending, commãding, & forcibly procuring ſuch actions as are ſinne. Thirdly, the Sunne concurreth neceſſarily not hauing free choice or will, and that by an action not immanent, or remaining in it ſelfe, but paſſing from it ſelfe into that wherein it worketh: wheras God concurreth freely, and at his owne will, and with ſuch a will and deſire as ſtill remaineth in himſelf, and therefore cannot corrupt another with ſinne, but muſt needs remayne corrupted himſelfe, ſeeing that will wherewith he willeth another to Sinne, is in himſelfe, and not in another.

Thirdly, it yet further followeth of this ſaid doctrine of Prot. that God alone doth only ſinne and not man: for it is moſt cleere and certayne, that no man can ſinne in that which he cannot poſſibly eſchew, but of neceſſity is forced to do: But according to (8) Zwinglius and Caluin, our firſt Parents euen in their Innocency could not eſchew Sinne, but of neceſſity committed the ſame.

(8) *De Prouid. c. 6. Calu. Inſtit. l. 1. c. 23. ſ. 7. 9. & de Prædeſt. p. 906.*

Fourthly, from all the Premiſſes we may gather, that if it be intolleratle blaſphemy to affirme God to be authour of ſinne, or him only truly to Sinne, that ſeeing man doth but that which God Commandeth and inforceth him to do, and God himſelfe being the chiefeſt goodnes, can do no euill; that, therefore there neyther is, nor euer was any ſinne at all, and ſo by neceſſary ſequele, no Iudgement, no hell, & in vaine Chriſts Incarnation & death for the Redemptiõ of Mankind: into ſuch Atheiſticall blaſphemies do Prot. fall.

SECT.

SECT. VI.

Obiections from Scripture, in proofe that God is the Author of Sinne, and decreeth the ſinne or damnation of man, anſwered.

SVch places are obiected as ſeeme to affirme that God cauſed ſinne, (1) *I the Lord, and there is none other, that forme light and create darknes, make peace and create euill.* (2) *Euill is deſcended from our Lord, into the gate of Hieruſalem.* (3) *Shall there be euill in the City which our Lord hath not done?* and ſuch like. But this is purpoſely anſwered and explained by ſundry Fathers, amongſt which writeth Tertullian, (4) *At all occaſions God is ready, be ſtriking and curing, killing and reuiuing, humbling & exalting, creating euill and making peace, that I alſo may here anſwere the heretikes: for behould, they ſay, be profeſſeth himſelfe the Creator of euill, ſaying, I am be that creates euill &c. But we vſing a diſtinction of both kinds, ſeparating the euill of ſinne, and the euils of punishment, the euils of fault and the euils of paine, do allot, to euery part their owne author, the Deuill the maker of the euils of ſinne and fault, God the maker of the euils of Punishment and paine, that, that part may be deputed to malice, this to Iuſtice, creating euill Iudgmentes againſt the euils of ſinne.* And the like Anſwere is made by Origen (5) and by S. Baſill in his (6) *Homilie, that God is not the author of Euils*; as alſo by S. Iohn Damaſcene (7) and Caſſian. But S. Auſtine explaineth this more fully in his Dialoge with Euodius, ſaying: (8) *Euod. Tell me I pray thee, whether God is not the Author of Euill? Aug. I will, If thou will make knowne of what euill thou demaundeſt. For two ſeuerall wayes we vſe to call euill: one when we affirme any man to haue done euill, another when he hath ſuffered euill. Euod. I deſire to know of both. Aug. But if thou knoweſt and beleeueſt God to be good (neither is it otherwiſe lawfull) he doth not euill. Againe, if we confeſſe God to be iuſt (and to deny this, it is ſacrilegious) as he giueth rewards to the good, ſo he giueth punishment to the euill, which punishments are euills to the ſufferers; Wherefore, if no man is punished vniuſtly, which*

(1) Iſa. 45. 6. 7.
(2) Michæ. 1. 12.
(3) Amos. 3. 6.
(4) Tert. Marcion. l. 2. c. 14.
(5) L. 6. cont. Celſum.
(6) Hom. 9.
(7) Orthod. fidei. l. 4. c. 20. Caſſ. Collat. 6. c. 5.
(8) De lib. Arb. l. 1. c. 1.

is neceſſary that we believe, ſeeing we believe the whole world to be gouerned by diuine prouidence, of that firſt kind of euils (to wit Sinnes) God by no meanes is the Author, but of the ſecond (to wit punishment.) Thus cleerly S. Auſtine. Agreably to this (9) our owne English Bybles in their marginall notes do expound this place of Eſay, of the euill of puniſhment, as namely of *warre* and *aduerſity*; which alſo appeareth, more plainly by oppoſition of the word *Peace*, there next precedent. And Nappier (10) anſwereth that of Amos 3. 6. and Mat. 6. 13. (11) commonly obiected by Caluins followers. Piſcator anſwereth that theſe ſayings are to be vnderſtood, (12) *De malo non culpæ, ſed pœnæ*, of the euill not of ſinne, but of punishment. And the like anſwere is made out of S. Auſtine by (13) Hiperius, and Bullinger.

(9) Engl. Bible of Anno 1576. in Eſay 45. 7.

(10) Vpon Reuel. c. 15. p. 190.

(11) *Pet. Mar. in loc. com. in Engl. part. 1. p. 110. Fulke 23. Rhem. Teſt. fol. 12; ſect. 6.*

(12) *Vol. 2. Thoſ. Theol. p. 173. 176. 202.*

(13) *Meth. Theol. p. 435. Bulling Dec. p. 49.*

Other places alſo are obiected which ſeeme to affirme that God decreed from all eternity that Sinnes ſhould be. (14) *There aſſembled in this Citty againſt thy holy Child Ieſus, Herod and Pontius Pilate &c. to do what thy Hand, and thy Councell decreed to be done.* But this forceth nothing, for in euill deeds it often happeneth, that the action is euill and the paſſion good, as in the death of our Sauiour, his betraying and crucifying were damnable Sinnes in the Iewes, and his patient and charitable ſuffering was meritorious and good in him. God therefore when he decreed the death of Chriſt, decreed thoſe vertuous actions which ſhyned in his Paſſion, the wickednes of the Iewes he decreed not, but only foreſaw and permitted it, which forſight and permiſſion were ſufficient to make Gods decree of Chriſtes death infallible. To this purpoſe writeth S. Epiphanius, (15) *Although the Scriptures ſay that Chriſt would be crucifyed, or that abſurdities are to be committed by vs in the laſt dayes, yet none of vs who do euill, ſhall find excuſe producing the Teſtimony of Scripture fortelling theſe things to be betraſter; for we do them not becauſe the Scripture hath ſayd it, but becauſe we were to do them, the Scripture fortelled by the foreknowledge of God &c. So alſo of the Croſſe, not becauſe diuine Scripture ſayd it, the Iewes crucifyed and Iudas betrayed our Sauiour, but becauſe Iudas was to betray him and the Iewes to crucify him, therefore the Scripture fortould in the old Teſtament, and our Lord in the Ghoſpell.* The

(14) *Act. 4. 27. 28. And ſee act. 2. 23.*

(15) *Conſt. Cæſ. lib. 38. Euſeb. Cæſar. de Præpar. Euang. l. 6. c. 9.*

(16) *In Disp. Theol. de Provid. Dei. sect.* 144. Prot. Sitzlinus also answereth this saying, (16) *The words Hand, and Councell, signify the good and healthfull end, for which God permitted that wicked facts of the Iewes, which he did neyther assist nor allow:* Euen as Ioseph sayd to his Brethren, (17) *Ye thought euill against me, God disposed it to good, that he might saue much people.*

(17) *Gen. 50. 20.*

Such textes also are vrged, as seeme to teach that God created the wicked to that end, that in their punishment he might manifest his power and Iustice; (18) *Our Lord hath wrought all things for himselfe, the impious also to the euill day.* (19) *Hath not the Potter of Clay, power, of the same masse, to make one vessell vnto honour, and another vnto Contumelie?* (20) *The Scripture saith to Pharao, that to this purpose haue I rayſed thee, that in thee I may shew my power, and that my name may be renowned in the whole Earth.* Answ. God createth not the wicked but only materially, that is, he createth those, whom he forseeth through their owne default, will be wicked, that so he may vse their iniquity, which he caused not or decreed, but only foresaw to the manifestation of his Iustice and power. And so by that of the Prouerbs is vnderstood, that God who worketh all things to his glory, hath created those whom he foresaw would be wicked, if they were created; that so in their deserued punishment he might manifest his Iustice. In like sort (as S. Austine (21) obserueth) God made not of matter, which was good or indifferent, vessels vnto contumelie, but of matter which was naught, contumelious, and damnable, he made some vessells, such as the said matter required, that was to contumelie, and others of his owne will and mercy to honour: Euen as the Potter, of clay, being a base matter, may make some vessels for base vses and others for noble: so that the vessels made to contumelie, haue of God, that they be vessels, but of the matter, that they be to reproch, and the other made to honour, haue both of God. And indeed, if God of matter good or indifferent, that is, if God from all Eternity should haue decreed some to damnation not forseeing their sinnes, it is plaine, that he could not be excused from iniquity and greatest cruelty. And as to the last place, I say with Rupertus, (22) that God forseeing Pha-

(18) *Prou. 16. 4.*

(19) *Rom. 9. 21.*

(20) *Rom. 9. 17.*

(21) *Ep. 105. ad Sixtum. & Ep. 106. ad Paulin.*

(22) *In Rom. 9. 17.*

Pharaos obſtinacy, wheras he might haue preuented him both of life and Kingdome, did notwithſtanding giue him both, that ſo he might vſe his malice to the exerciſe of his people, and manifeſtation of his owne power in his puniſhments. Laſtly, theſe obiections are ſo litle forcing, that they are all of them explained and anſwered by Bullinger, (23) Hiperius, Snecanus, and Piſcator, all of them Caluiniſtes. Adde yet, that the long patience mentioned in the texte, wherwith God ſuffered the veſſels of wrath, argueth, that, as Hiperius ſayth, (24) *They were created good, and afterwards became euill of their proper will, being made veſſels of wrath, becauſe that voluntarily they were to become euill.* Otherwiſe if God had willed and decreed their deſtruction without reſpect of their ſinne, how could it be ſaid that *he ſuffered them in long patience?* Yea the ſame Apoſtle ſpeaking elswhere, (25) *Of veſſels vnto contumelie*, ſaith, *that if any man ſhall cleanſe himſelfe from theſe, he ſhalbe a veſſell vnto honour.*

Others further obiect ſuch places as ſeeme to affirme that God moueth, compelleth, or commãdeth men to ſinne, or vſeth them as his Inſtruments of ſinne. (26) *The fury of our Lord added to be angrie againſt Iſrael, and ſtirred vp Dauid among them ſaying, Goe number Iſrael and Iuda.* (27) *Our Lord hath commanded him to curſe Dauid.* Anſw. The true meaning of theſe and ſuch like places is, that God permitteth the will to ſinne: and ſo accordingly do other Scriptures explaine them, as where it is ſaid, (28) *Why then did Moyſes command to giue a bill of Diuorce, and to diſmiſſe her? He ſaith to them, becauſe Moyſes for the hardnes of your hart permitted you to diſmiſſe your wyues, but from the beginning it was not ſo.* So alſo Dauids numbring of the people, is attributed to the Deuill. (29) *And Satan roſe againſt Iſrael, and moued Dauid to number Iſrael.* Wherfore God is only ſaid to moue Dauid therto, becauſe he permitted the Deuill to do it, without which permiſſion he had not done it. And this vnderſtanding of theſe and ſuch like places is made by S. Auſtine, (30) and S. Iohn Damaſcene (31). Yea S. Auſtine ſpeaking of thoſe words of S. Paul, (32) *God will ſend them the operation of Errour to believe lying*, expoundeth them thus, (33) *God will ſend, becauſe he will permitte the Deuill to do theſe*

(21) *Dec. 3. ſer. 10. p. 493. 494. Hiper. Meth. Theol. l. 2. p. 435. 438. Snecan. Meth. deſcri. de Prædeſt. c. 6. p. 514. 515. 520. 525. 701. Piſc. Vol. 1. Theſ. Theol. 7. p. 202. 178.*

(24) *Meth. Theol. d. 2. p. 438.*

(23) 2. Tim. 2. 20. 21.

(26) 2. Reg. 24. 1.

(27) 2. Reg. 16. 10. *And ſee the like. 3. Reg. 22. 22. Pſ. 43. 18. & 118. 36. Mat. 6. 11.*

(28) *Mat. 19. 7. 8. And ſee Deut. 24. 1. 2.*

(29) 1. Parel. 21. 1.

(30) *Tract. 31. in Ioan. & de Gra. & lib. Arb. c. 20. & l. 2. ad Simpl. q. 2. & ep. 89. q. 2.*

(31) *Orthod. fidei. l. 4. c. 20.*

(32) 2. Theſſ. 2. 11.

(33) *De ciuit. l. 20. c. 30.*

these things. Agreably sayth (34) Knox, *Neither to Pharao, neither to Semei, nor yet to any other Reprobate, doth God giue either wicked Commandement, or euill thought &c.* Yea God himselfe mentioning the sinfull action of the people, explaineth this point, saying, (35) *I commanded it not, nor spake it, neither came it into my mynd.*

Others yet obiect, that God hardeneth the harts of Sinners. (36) *I will indurate his hart,* with sundry such like in (37) other places. Answ. The same Scriptures do explaine this saying, (38) *Pharao seeing that rest was giuen, he hardned his owne hart, and heard them not, as our Lord had Commanded.* S. Austine also expoundeth it, that God hardned Pharaos hart, (39) *not by giuing him malice, but by not giuing him mercy.* And for this exposition are the Fathers reiected by (40) Caluin. And that by Gods hardning of his hart is vnderstood his suffering it to be hardned; it is further taught by the Prot. writers (41) Bullinger, Hiperius, Vrsinus, Paulus Abeitzen, Marbachius, and the Confession of Heluetia: In so much that Conradus Scluſſelburge answereth directly heerto in these wordes: (42) *God is not by any meanes the cause of Sinne, neyther doth he will sinne, or approue sinne. As concerning the phrases of Scripture, I will harden the hart of Pharao, He hath giuen them into a Reprobate mynd &c. it appeareth by the word of God, that those sayings are to be vnderstood of Gods permission, whereby he suffereth man to rage in Sinne, by the iust iudgement of God, wherewith he punisheth sinnes with sinnes, yet doth he not cause them nor approue them.* Melanchon also giueth the lyke answere saying (43) *Neyther do those figures of wordes offend, I will harden the hart of Pharao, and the lyke: for it is certayne that in the Hebrew phrase they signify permission, not an efficacious will.* Another Prot. agreably writeth, (44) *Let the studious know, the Hebrew phrase in those wordes, I will harden the hart of Pharao, to signify permission &c. And examples euery where concurre, which testify by this Hebrew Phrase very often, Permission to be signified.* Anthony Maxey Chaplayne to the late Kings Maiesty sayth, (45) *It is well knowne vnto the learned, that where it is sayd, God hardeneth, the Hebrew Dialect doth signify, a permission, not an action.*

So that God hardeneth not the hart of a sinner positiue-

(34) *Ag. the Adu. of Gods Præd. p. 174.*
(35) *Hier. 19. 5.*
(36) *Ex. 7. 3.*
(37) *Ios. 11. 20. Iob. 12. 24. Isa. 63. 17. Io. 12. 40. Rom. 1. 28. 9. 18.*
(38) *Exod. 8. 15. & 9. 34. 1. Reg. 6. 6.*
(39) *Ep 105. ad Sixtum. & l. 2. ad Simpl. q. 2. circ. med. & in Io. tra. 53.*
(40) *In H. l. 2. sect. 4. c. 2.*
(41) *Dec. p. 491. 491. Hiper. Meth. Theol. p. 438. Vrsin. Catech. p. 311. 312. Abeitz. Rudiment. art. Dial. p. 540. Marbach. Disp. Theol. de Prouid. sect 164. &c. Harm. of Confess. p. 61.*
(42) *Theol. Calu. l. 2. c. de Prædest.*
(43) *Loc. com. c. de caus. pec. & conuing.*

ly, but only negatiuely, that is, by permitting, forſaking, and not taking pitty: wherin is no iniuſtice, ſeeing God forſaketh not but being firſt forſaken, and it is but iuſt, that thoſe who forſake, be forſaken. And according to this as S. Paul ſaid (46) *God hath deliuered them vp vnto the deſires of their hart into vncleanes:* ſo elswhere he explicateth this ſaying, (47) *Who deſpayring haue giuen vp themſelues to impudicity, vnto the operation of all vncleanes.* And ſo where God is ſaid, (48) *to haue afflicted Iob,* it is euident by the ſtory, that he only (49) at the inſtance of Satan, permitted him to afflict Iob. Eſay alſo ſaith (50) *make the hart of this people fat, and ſhut their eies:* which S. Iohn alledging ſaith, (51) *He hath blinded their eies and indurated their hart:* But this our Sauiour himſelfe and S. Paul explaine, ſaying, (52) *their eies they haue ſhut.* And K. Dauid moſt plainly ſaying, (53) *My people would not heare my voice, and Iſrael would none of me, ſo I gaue them vp to the hardnes of their hart.*

Others greatly inſiſt vpon theſe wordes of S. Paul, (54) *When they were not yet borne, nor had done any good or euill (that the purpoſe of God according to Election might ſtand) not of workes, but of the caller, it was ſaid to her, That the Elder ſhall ſerue the yonger, as it is written, Iacob I loued, but Eſau I hated.* Anſw. This ſaying of the Apoſtle being taken, the firſt part therof from (55) Moyſes, the later from (56) Malachie, is (as the Proteſtants Chriſtmanus (57) and Kinnedoncius do acknowledge) ſpoken of the ſeuerall poſterities of Iacob & Eſau: which alſo is plainly ſignifyed by the whole context of Malachie; for wheras Eſau was called (58) *Edom*, Malachie vnderſtandeth Eſaus Poſterity, (59) *If Idumea ſhall ſay, we are deſtroyed &c.* as alſo by theſe other euident words of Moyſes, (60) *Two Nations are in thy wombe, and two peoples ſhalbe deuided out of thy wombe, and &c. the Elder ſhall ſerue the yonger.* And like as by Gods forſaid loue to Iacob is ſignified the temporall felicity of his Poſterity (61) about the other; ſo likewiſe by Gods forſaid hating of Eſau, is in like manner vnderſtood the temporall infelicity of his Poſterity and Nation, as Malachy conuinceth ſaying, (62) *I loued Iacob, but hated Eſau, and I laid his mountaines into a wildernes, and his Inheritance vnto the Dragons of the Deſart.* And though it appeare by this Epiſtle of S. Paul, that the

(44) *Corpus Doctr. Chriſ. p.* 618.
(45) In his 2. Sermon printed. 1607.
(46) *Rom.* 1. 24.
(47) *Eph* 4. 19.
(48) Iob. 1. 11. & 2. 3. 4.
(49) *Iob* 1. 11. & 2. 5.
(50) *C.* 6. 9.
(51) Io. 12. 40.
(52) *Mat.* 13. 15. *Act.* 28. 27.
(53) *Pſ.* 80. 12. 13.
(54) *Ro.* 9. 11.
(55) *Gen.* 25. 23.
(56) *Mal.* 1. 2. 3.
(57) Diagraph. p. 76. Kinned. in his Redempt. of mankind. p. 194.
(58) *Gen.* 25. 30. & 36. 1.
(59) *Cap.* 1. 4.
(60) *Gen.* 25. 23.
(61) *Gen.* 25. 23.
(62) *Mal.* 1. 2. 3.

Iewes hauing indeed ſome (63) *Prehemineuce* aboue the Gentils, *becauſe the words of God were* (firſt) *committed to them*, did thervpon ouer much extoll themſelues aboue the others, as being (64) perſuaded, that the Promiſes of Grace were peculiar to themſelues and their carnall ſucceſſion. In further Confutation wherof, though alſo the Apoſtle in the place obiected, do by application therof, transferre the forſaid Example of Iacob and Eſau being twinnes; and ſo vnder the reſemblance or type of them, doth ſhew, that like as Iacob being the yonger Brother, was neuertheles by God loued, and preferred to the promiſed land of Canaan, before his elder Brother Eſau; that ſo likewiſe in the promiſes of Grace and the Ghoſpell, the Iewes forſaid externall Prerogatiue doth not ſo preuaile, but that the Gentiles, being in reguard therof, but as it were the yonger Brother to them, are neuertheleſſe in the Grace and riches of the Ghoſpell (65) equalled, if not preferred (66) before them: Gods Election and mercy ſo ſhewed, depending vpon his owne purpoſe & determination, and not reſtrained to any Nation, family, or people: yet all this auayleth nothing to eſtabliſh Gods abſolute Decree of eternall hatred and reprobation; for if the forſaid wordes, *I haue loued Iacob, and hated Eſau* (being heretofore proued to be ſpoken not of their perſons, but of their poſterity and Nations) ſhould be vrged in this ſenſe; then as Chriſtmanus (67) anſwereth, it would follow, that all the poſterity of Iacob were Elect, and none of them reprobate, and all the poſterity of Eſau reprobate, and none of them Elect, which were abſurd to hold.

(63) Rom. 3. 1.2.

(64) Rom. 3. 29. & 9.8.

(65) Rom. 9. 24.

(66) See Rom. 9. 30, 31.

(67) Diegraph. p. 78.

Secondly I further anſwere, that though the forſaid words of Gods hating Eſau, ſhould concerne the perſon of Eſau, and withall were not to be vnderſtood of his temporall infelicity, but otherwiſe; yet this hatred of God is not to be taken poſitiuely, but as Chriſtmanus (68) and Snecanus do explaine the ſame, negatiuely, that is to ſay, for, not to loue, or not to haue mercy, according to other like examples herof in the (69) Scriptures.

(68) Vbi ſup. Snecan. Meth. deſcrip. p. 517.

(69) Io. 12. 25. Luc. 14. 26.

Thirdly, though it were to be taken poſitiuely, yet ſhould

ſhould it be ſo referred, not to his Creature Eſau, which he made, for, (70) *All that he made was very good.* and, (71) *Thou loueſt all things that are, and hateſt nothing of thoſe which thou haſt made: for thou diddeſt not ordaine or make any thing hating it:* but to the ſinne of Eſau, which he foreſaw, and neuer made. And agreably to this ſaith Beza; (72) *We confeſſe God hateth nothing in man but ſinne.* Now that Gods foreſight and hatred of Eſaus ſinne, doth not of neceſſity impugne freewill in Eſau, or proue his reall reprobation, appeareth moſt euidently by the example of Adam, whoſe ſinne before his fall, God both foreſaw and (73) hated; and yet as Prot. (74) confeſſe, the ſame notwithſtanding, Adam before his fall had freewill, & was alſo one of the Elect, as S. Auſtine (75) proueth againſt the Tacianiſtes.

(70) Gen. 1. 31.
(71) Sap. 11. 25.
(72) Diſt. lay of Popiſh practiſes. p. 27.
(73) Pſ. 45. 7. Zach. 8. 17.
(74) Bulling. Dec. 3. Ser. 10. p. 490 Hip. Meth. Theol. l. 1 p. 214. 219. Snecan. Meth. deſcript. p. 223. 226. 778.
(75) L. de bono perſeuer. 23.

Fourthly, wheras S. Peter forwarned vs that in *S. Pauls* (76) *Epiſtles there are certaine things hard to be vnderſtood,* amongſt the reſt this his foreſaid diſcourſe vpon Iacob and Eſau, hath euer bene taken for one of the Principall, wherfore it is altogeather vnequall, that this ſo obſcure ſaying or diſcourſe ſhould be alleadged againſt ſo many and ſo cleere texts, as I haue formerly produced. Laſtly this very Obiection is at larg anſwered by (77) Snecanus, Hemingius, Chriſtmanus & Geſnerus, all of them Proteſtant writers.

(76) 2. Pet. 3. 16.
(77) Meth. deſcrip. l. p. 55. ad p. 537. Heming. de Grat. vniuer. p. 34. 37. Chriſtm. Diag. p. 73. &c. Geſn. Diſp. pro lib. concord. p. 620.

Others yet obiect that, (78) Chriſt is to thoſe that *beliue, honour; but to them that beliue not &c. a Stone of offence &c. to them that ſtumble at the word, neither do beliue, wherin alſo they are put:* wherupon it is inferred, that they were ordained by God not to beliue. Which ſequele if it hold, how then is God excuſed from being author of their not beliuing, and ſo of their ſinne? I anſwere therfore, that the ſenſe herof (is moſt directly againſt Proteſtantes) that they were put or ordained to beliue, but did not; which ſenſe is acknowledged by Snecanus, (79) Caſtalio Illiricus, and Luther.

(78) 1. Pet. 2. 8.
(79) Meth. deſcrip. p. 701 Caſt. Diſſuſ. Tranſl. p. 132. 133 &c Illic. Gloſſ. in 2. c. 13. ſect. 6.

Fulke vrgeth thoſe wordes of Chriſt, (80) *Lead vs not into temptation: wherby* (ſaith he) *is proued, not only a permiſſion, but an action of God:* and that, *He not only permitteth, but alſo leadeth into temptation:* Yea, ſaith Peter Martyr, (82) *God tempteth,*

(80) Mat. 6. 13.
(81) Ag. Rh. Teſt. in Mat.

Pet. 2. 8. Luth. in 1. Pet. 2. 8. (80) Mat. 6. 13. (81) Ag. Rh. Teſt. in Mat. (82) Com. plac. in Engl. part. 1. c. 18. p. 220.

pieth, and (83) driueth men vnto ſinne by temptation: But though this be ſufficiently anſwered in the Obiection of Induration: yet in further cleering therof, I ſay, 1. that the Scriptures themſelues do explaine this. *Let* (84) *no man* (ſaith S. Iames) *when he is tempted, ſay that he is tempted of God, for God is not a tempter of euils, and he tempteth no man: but euery one is tempted of his owne Concupiſcence &c.* S. Paul teacheth that God is ſo farre from leading vs into temptation, that to the contrary he deliuereth vs from temptation: (85) *God is faithfull, who will not ſuffer you to be tempted aboue that which you are able, but will make alſo with temptation iſſue, that you may be able to ſuſtaine.* 2. S. Auſtine ſaith, (86) *And do not lead vs into temptation, it is vnderſtood do not permit vs to be led, by forſaking.* S. Cyprian readeth, *Do not ſuffer vs to be led.* 3. The Prot. Nappier anſwereth this ſaying, (88) *It is ſaid in the Lords prayer, lead vs not into temptation &c. not that the Lord tempteth vs &c. but only that the temptation and euill doth flow from the permiſſion, and ſufferance of his Maieſty &c.* And agreably ſaith Bullinger (89) *Suffer vs not to be led by a Deuilish and wicked temptation.* And the ſame Expoſition is made by (90) Melancthon, and (91) the Diuines of Wittemberge. So inſufficient are all obiections made by Prot. in proofe of their blaſphemous Doctrine.

(81) *Ibid. p. 111.*

(84) *Iac. 1. 13. 14.*

(85) *1. Cor. 10. 13.*

(86) *Ep. 89. q. 2.*

(88) *Vpon Reuel. in c. 15. p. 190.*

(89) *Decad. p. 949.*

(90) *Loc. com. cap. de Cauſa pec. &c.*

(91) *Catecheſis. p. 205.*

CHAP.

CHAP. XXXI.

The true State of the Queſtion concerning Freewill.

Whether man after Adams fall hath freewill with Gods grace, to do ſuch things as belong to Saluation, and not to do them: or whether the Will concurreth only as a naturall Inſtrument of God, and not as a free Cauſe.

SECT. I.

Catholike Doctrine.

FReewill (according to S. Gregory (1) Niſſen) *being of all things that are in man the beſt and the moſt excellent; and a thing ſo manifeſt that whoſoeuer denyeth it, is not a Catholicke*, ſaith (2) S. Auſtine: In defence thertore therof againſt Heretickes, the Catholicke Church decreeth that, (3) *If any ſhall ſay, the Freewill of man moued and ſtirred by God, to cooperate nothing by aſenting to God mouing and calling, wherby he may diſpoſe, and prepare himſelfe to obtaine the grace of Iuſtification, neither that he can diſſent if he will, but as a thing without lyfe to do nothing at all, and to beare himſelfe meerly paſſiuely, Anathema.* And, (4) *If any ſhall affirme mans freewill to haue bene loſt and extinguiſhed after Adams ſinne &c. Anathema.*

(1) *In Eccleſiaſt. ho. 2, & ho. 4. Cant.*
(2) *L. de Gra. & lib. Arb. c. 2.*
(3) *Conc. Trid. Seſſ. 6, Can. 4.*
(4) *Can. 5.*

In the fourth Toletane Councell it is decreed that, (5) *As man by his freewill obeying the Serpent perished; ſo the grace of God calling, by conuerſion of his owne mynd, euery man by beleeuing is ſaued: Therfore not by force, but by the freewill of the mynd, they are to be perſuaded, not inforced to be conuerted.* In the Councell Senonenſe it is thus defyned, (6) *This hereſie wholly taking away the liberty of the will, we do not ſo much condemne, being alreadylong ſince condemned by the Church and ſacred Councels, as we do declare it to be contrary to the common Counſaile of men, and to the plaine Teſtimonies of Scripture.*

All Catholickes (7) believe, that the Will of Man concurreth with Gods Grace actiuely, and freely to the worke of Piety; in ſuch ſort, that it is in mans free Choice to cooperate with Gods Grace, or to reſiſt the ſame: And that this freedome is not only from Coaction, but from Neceſſity.

Points Diſputable.

All Schoolmen granting Freewill, (8) Some place the ſame in the coniunction of 2. Actes, to wit, of the Iudgement of Reaſon, and Election of the Will: But (9) others better, place it only in the Will.

Some (10) make it conſiſt in Act. (11) Others in a certaine naturall habit aryſing from Reaſon & the Will. (12) Others make it a particuler faculty diſtinct from the reaſon and the will. (13) Others, to be the very faculties of reaſon and will. Others (14) moſt probably teach, that it is one particular facultie, to wit, the Will it ſelfe.

Some (15) teach, that the will of Man is partly actiue, partly paſſiue. Others (16) better, that it is abſolutly actiue.

Some (17) thinke, that the will is not free in regard of actions preſent. (18) Others thinke the beginning of the action to be free, but the continuation neceſsary. But (19) others beſt, make not only actions future free, but alſo preſent, & that either in regard of their beginning or continuation.

Some (20) thinke it inexplicable in this lyfe to accord Freewill

(5) Conc. Tolet. 4. Cap. 37. de Iudæis.
(6) Cap. 15. de lib. Arb.
(7) Bellar. de Grat. & lib. Arb. l. 6. c. 20. Rhem. Teſt. in Io. 1. 12. & in 2. Cor. 3. 5.
(8) Pet. Lombar. in 2. ſent. Diſt. 24. lit. E.
(9) S. Tho. 1. p. q. 83. art. 3. ad 2.
(10) Heruæus quodlibet. 10. q. 2.
(11) S. Bonau. 2. Diſt. 25. art. 2. q. 2. 3. 4.
(12) Alex. Halenſ. 2. p. Sum. q. 72. Mem 2. art. 3.
(13) Durand. 2. Sent. diſt. 24. q 3.
(14) S. Tho. 2. p. Sum q. 83. Art. 2. 2. 3. & in 1. 2. q. 23.
(15) Palud. 4. Sent. diſt. 49. q. 1. Caiet. 2 p. q. 80. art. 2.
(16) Scotus 2. diſt. 25. Henric. quodlib. 10. q. 9. (17) Lombar. l. 2. Sent. diſt. 35. Occam. & Gabr. 2. Sent. diſt. 38. (18) Greg. Arimin. 2. Sent. Diſt. 38. (19) Scotus. 2. Sent. diſt. 3. Capreol. 2. diſt. 25. (20) Caiet. 1. p. q. 22. art. 4.

Freewil with Gods Prouidence. (21) Others teach that God with his concurſe doth determine the actions of mans will, and that put, the Will cannot but worke, yet abſolutely is free in ſeuerall reſpects. (22) Others more probably, accord thē, in that Gods concurſe doth not determine the Will, or worke any thing in it, but immediatly floweth into the effect, and produceth in the ſame moment wherin it is produced by the Will. (23) Others moſt probably, do acknowledge, that Gods cooperation doth ſo concurre with the will, that it doth not only giue, and preſerue in it the power of working, but alſo doth moue, and apply it to worke: which diuine influxe or vertue, wherwith the will is moued and applyed, is receiued in the ſecond cauſes, according to their diſpoſition. Sundry other ſuch like differences there are, not defyned by the Church.

(21) *Arminius in Mer.* c.1.2.

(22) *Greg. Arimin. Scotus, Gabr. in 2. Sent. Diſt.37.*

(23) S. Tho. 1.p q.105.art. 5.& l.3. cont. Gent.c.70.

Proteſtant Vntruthes.

Luther teacheth that, (24) *The name of Freewill was moſt hatefull to all the Fathers, although we our ſelues graunt, God to haue giuen to Man freewill.* But this wilbe proued to be falſe by the third Section following. If you will belieue Swinglius, (25) *Freewill or merit cannot indeed be affirmed, although no man denyeth their names and mention to be found in the Scriptures, but truly no otherwiſe, then that they be names of thoſe things, which are proper only to God.* But I referre the reader to the next Section, wherin he ſhall ſee, that the Scriptures do aboundantly aſcribe Freewill alſo to man.

(24) *In Colloq. Latinis. cap. de lib. Arb.*

(25) *Tom. 2. de Prouid. c. 6.* fol.371.

Proteſtant Doctrine.

Luther, (26) Caluin, and other Prot. teach that, *the foreknowledge and omnipotency of God do directly fight with our freewill.* And that, (27) *Freewill is but a fiction in things, or a title without Subſtance: becauſe (ſay they) it is in no mans power to thinke any thing euill or good, but all things &c happen by abſolute neceſſity.* According to Whitaker, (28) *In our conuerſion to God which is made by grace, our freewill hath no ſtrength in it, but we carry our ſelues in this buſines meerly paſsiuely.* Perkins ſaith, (29) *Hence I gather*

(26) *Luth in Aſſert. art.* 30.

(27) *Luth in Aſſert. art.* 30.

(28) *L.2.de pec.orig.c.3.* p.615.

(29) *Tom.2. in Apoc.3.* col.224.

gather the Papiſts to dote, in that they affirme, in Regeneration man to haue freewill, and the vſe therof, and that he can diſpoſe himſelfe in Iuſtification.

(30) Proum. l. cont. Pelag. fin.
(31) De fide cont. Manich. c 9. & Chriſoſt. ho. 45. in Ioan.
(32) De vniuerſali Gratia p. 109.
(33) L. 3. Recognit.
(34) L. de hær. c. 35.
(35) Ib. c. 70. S. Leo Ep. 91. ad Turbium, Conc. Bracar. 1. Can. 10.
(36) Tho. Waldenſ. l. 2. Doctrinalis fidei. c. 10.
(37) Luther in Aſſert. Art. 36. Wiccleuus in Trialogo. c. 10. 11.
(38) L. de concordia Doct. c. de lib. Arb. See Caluin. Inſt. l. 1. c. 16. §. 2.
(39) Poſtil in die Nat. fol. 62.
(40) Riuallus in Controu. tract. 3 ſect. 27.

Proteſtants agree with Ancient Hereticks.

S. Hierome auoucheth that, (30) *It is proper to the Manichees to condemne mans nature, and to take away Freewill, and the Aſsiſtance of God. The Manichees* (ſayth S. (31) Auſtine) *barke againſt thoſe with wonted blindnes, and when they are conuinced that nature is not an euill thing, and that it is in the power of man to do well or euill, they ſay that the ſoule hath not freewill, and they ſee not their blindnes.* Herupon it is, that Hemingius (32) chargeth his other Prot. Brethren denying *Freewill, with the Doctrine of the Manichees and the Stoickes.* For the ſame Hereſie of denying freewill, Simon Magus is condemned by S. Clement, (33) the Bardaſanes by S. (34) Auſtine, the Priſcillianiſts by S. Auſtine, (35) S. Leo, and the Councell Bracarenſe.

Proteſtant Errours.

Abaylardus (36) taught that God cannot make any other but thoſe thinges which he maketh. (37) Luther thinketh Wicliffes opinion good, which is, that all things happen of abſolute Neceſſity. And Bucer (38) auoucheth that, whatſoeuer God doth, he doth neceſſarily, and cannot do otherwiſe. Luther is of opinion that, (39) *No otherwiſe then if God ſhould conuert ſome dry ſtocks, into a new, greene, & flouriſhing tree, doth the Grace of God renew man:* ſo making man a meere ſtock. And others belieue, that we concurre no more to our Conuerſion, then to our (40) *Creation, and* (41) *Reſurrection.*

Some Prot. further teach, that man hath not freewill ſo much as to ſinne. Caluin, (42) *It is ſtrange, if it ſeeme to any ahard ſpeech, that I ſay, the Will being without liberty, is neceſſarily either drawne or moued to euill.* And, (43) *The ſenſuall man doth neceſſarily yield himſelfe obedient to euery motion of Satan.* And therfore Caluin (44) wiſheth that the Name of Freewill might be quite taken away.

Danæus, (45) *This is falſe, ſinnes to be the actes of freewill. They*

are

are indeed the actes of ſpontane (or not compelled) *not of freewill.* Paræus thinketh, that *Euery* (46) *ſinne is not voluntary.* So that according to theſe Prot. whatſoeuer God doth, he doth neceſſarily: and that all things happen of abſolute neceſſity: Man concurring to his owne Converſion to God, no more then a ſtock: and that he hath not ſo much as freewill to ſinne. Then all which, what more blockiſh and impious?

(41) L. Concordiæ c. de lib. Arb. p. 680.
(42) Inſtit. l. 2. c. 3. ſ. 5.
(43) Ib.
(44) Inſtit. l. 2. c. 2. ſ. 4.
(45) Controu. 6. p. 1224.
(46) Colloq. Theol. 2. Diſp. 3.

SECT. II.

It is proued by Scriptures, that Man after Adams fall, hath freewill with Gods Grace to do good, and eſchew euill.

TO examine now the Doctrine by the Sacred Scriptures, (1) *Our Lord ſayd to* (Cain) *why art thou angry? If thou do well, ſhalt not thou receiue againe: but if thou doſt ill, ſhall not thy ſinne forthwith be preſent at the doore? But the luſt thereof ſhalbe vnder thee, and thou ſhalt haue Dominion ouer it.* This text is ſo cleere for *freewill*, that ſome Prot. (2) for their beſt euaſion, do Tranſlate, *not ouer it*, but *ouer him*, to wit, ouer his Brother Abel: but this ſatisfyeth nothing, for by congruity of conſtruction, the word *Sinne*, being the Antecedent next before mentioned, the Relatiue *illius*, muſt be referred vnto it: the coherence alſo of ſenſe argueth the ſame, for to read *Sinne lyeth at the doore* (to torment thy Conſcience as (3) Prot. do expound) *and thou ſhalt haue rule ouer him, thy Brother*, is in ſenſe diſſolute and inconſequent: whereas on the contrary to read. *Sinne lyeth at the doore, and thou ſhalt haue rule ouer it*, is direct plaine & conſequent: yea the former Trāſlation is ſo corrupt, & abſurd, that other Prot. in their Tranſlations (4) and (5) writings, do follow our vulgar, reiecting this other.

Freewill is alſo proued by ſuch places as teach that it is in mans free choice to do good or euill. So Moyſes appointed by God, ſaid vnto the Children of Iſrael, (6) *This Commandement that I command thee this day is not aboue thee &c. But the word is very neere thee in thy mouth, and thy hart to do it &c. Conſider that I haue ſet before thee this day lyfe and good, and contrariwiſe* gandus in

(1) Ibidem.
(2) The great Engl. Bible of Anno 1577. & in 4. of Anno 1584. and ſee the marg. notes there. Caſtalio in his Bible.
(3) Hip. Meth Th. l. 2. p. 478. Luth. Tom. 6. Wittemb. f. 62. Wi-

ſyntag. col. 489. (6) Deut. 30. 11. 14. 15. 16. 17. 18. 19. See alſo Ioſ. 24. 13. Eccl. 15. 12.

wiſe death and euill, that thou maieſt loue our Lord thy God, and walke in his wayes, and keepe his Commandements &c. But if thy hart be auerted, and thou wilt not heare &c. thou ſhalt periſh &c. I call for witneſſe this day heauen and earth, that I haue propoſed to you lyfe & death, bleſsing and curſing: Chooſe therfore lyfe that thou mayeſt liue. Here God giueth free choice to men to do good or euill.

But D. Fulke anſwereth, that this is vnderſtood (7) *of the knowledge of the law, and not of the ſtrength that men haue to keepe it*: but the wordes of the text are directly againſt this, *to do it, to walke in his wayes, keepe his Commandements, chooſe lyfe*: In ſo much, that Hiperius acknowledgeth this ſaying of Deutronomy to be vnderſtood (8) *Of the fulfilling of the Commandementes, as ſome wordes next before* (ſaith he) *ſeeme to import*. And then himſelfe would further euade by affirming, that it was ſpoken, *To men regenerate*: wheras it is euident to the contrary by the circumſtances (9) of the ſame place, that it was ſpoken to the promiſcuous multitude in generall, contayning in it both good and euill.

Such places alſo confirme Freewill, as ſhew that it is mans fault why he doth not good, and eſchew euill: ſo God complaineth by his Prophet Iſay, (10) *Iudge betweene me and my vineyard: what is there that I ought to do more to my vineyard, & haue not done to it? whether that I looked it ſhould yeeld grapes, and it hath yeelded wild grapes?* So likewiſe Chriſt reproueth Hieruſalem, ſaying, (11) *How often would I gather togeather thy Children &c & thou wouldſt not.* And S. Stephen to the Iewes, (12) *You alwaies reſiſt the holy Ghoſt.* And the like might be produced from ſundry (13) other texts: from which it may be argued, that either he who ſinneth, hath it in his power to ſinne, or hath it not: if the firſt, then freewill; if the ſecond, then in vaine ſhould God complaine of man for ſinning, ſeeing he could not do otherwiſe.

But Caluin anſwereth to theſe laſt wordes of S. Stephen, (14) *They are ſaid to reſiſt the Holy Ghoſt, who obſtinatly reiect him ſpeaking in the Prophets, for it is not here treated of ſecret Reuelations which God inwardly inſpireth to euery one, but of the externall Miniſtery*: But if they did obſtinatly reiect him ſpeaking in the Prophets; then it proueth, that they had power and will

18.17. *And* 31.11. *And*, 1. Cor 7.36.37. 2. Cor. 9 7. *Dan.*13. 20.21. *Reg.*14. 12.13. *Reg.*3 5. *Pſ.* 83 11. & 118. 30.173. *Prou.* 8.10. *Iſa* 66. 4. *Dan* 13.22. *Mat.*11.14. *Mar.*10.36. 51. *Luc*, 10. 42. Io. 6.67. *Heb* 12.24.

(7) *Defenſ. of the Engl. Tranſl.p.*326.

(8) *Matth. Theol.l.*2. *p.* 479. 480.

(9) *Ver.*1.17. 28.29.

(10) C. 5.3 4.

(11) *Mat.*23. 37.

(12) *Act.*7. 51.

(13) *Num.* 24.43 *Iſa.*65. 12. *Hier.* 7.13. 23 24.26. 27. 28. *Ezech.*18. 31. *Io.*6.67. *Apoc.*3.20. *Tren.*1.24.

(14) *In hunc locum.*

will to reiect him ſo ſpeaking: And no reaſon can be imagined, why man may not alwell reſiſt internall inſpirations, as externall Miniſtery.

Neither will it ſuffice to anſwere, that God may well complaine, though man cannot but ſinne, becauſe that his weaknes proceeded firſt from his owne fault and hereditary malice: for originall ſinne being remitted, that hereditary malice and weaknes is not a fault, but a puniſhment of the fault. And therfore as none might rightly reprehend a man borne blind for ſtumbling, though the ſaid blindnes proceed from originall ſinne; ſo neither ought ſinners to be blamed, if without free conſent, by the only corruption of nature, which remaineth in them through Adams ſinne, they at any tyme tranſgreſſe the Commandementes of God.

Chriſt ſayth, (15) *Either make the tree good, and his fruite good; or make the tree euill, and his fruite euill*: This ſheweth, that it is in mans freewill to be a good tree, or an ill tree, to bring forth good fruite, or bad. (15) *Mat.12. 33.*

Freewill alſo is further taught by all ſuch texts wherin ſomething is promiſed by God with Condition, that he wil coopera: ſo ſaith God himſelf, (16) *if you be willing & will heare me, you ſhall eate the good things of the Earth; but if you will not, and will prouoke me to wrath, the ſword ſhall deuour you*: So alſo Chriſt our Sauiour, (17) *If thou wilt enter into lyfe, keep the Cõmandments*; with ſundry ſuch like. Now if it be in our power to perform or fullfill the condition offered, then haue we Freewill, if it be not, then is it not any true conditionall Promiſe, but only a playne irrition, which were impious to affirme of God. (16) *Iſa. 1 19, 20.* (17) *Mat.19. 17.* (18) *1. Cor. 10.13.* (19) *Io. 1.12.* (20) *In Nou. Teſt. Londini. Anno 1587.*

The Scriptures alſo teſtify that, (18) *God is faythfull, who will not ſuffer you to be tempted aboue that which you are able, but will make alſo with temptation yſſue that you may be able to ſuſtayne.* And S. Iohn ſpeaking of Chriſt ſayth (19) *As many as receiued him, he gaue them power to be made the Sonnes of God:* where the word *power*, is ſo conuincing for freewill, that (20) Beza tranſlateth it *dignity*: but he is therefore forſaken by other (21) Prot. who tranſlate with Vs, *power*: and reproued for the ſame by Caſtalio, ſaying: (22) *In the 1. Chapter of Iohn and the 12 verſe, he depraueth a moſt excellent place, and of greateſt moment, thus tranſlating,* (21) *Pulk. cg. Rhem. Teſt. in 1 Io. 12. And the Engl. Bible of Anno 1570.* (22) *In Defenſ. Tranſlat. p. 283.*

ſtating. But as many as receiued him, he gaue them this dignity, that they might be made the ſonnes of God. For ἐξουσία, *is Power*, in no place, *Dignity*, *or let him cite the place*; *but in behalfe of his owne opinion, he expounded it falſly: for he would not that Chriſtians haue this power from Chriſt which is nothing elſe but to enuy Chriſtes benefit to Chriſtians &c. For it is a greater benefit of Chriſt, and more worthy the ſonnes of God, to haue free power then otherwiſe: euen as it is a greater benefit of God towards man, that they can freely ſpeake or be ſilent, then if without free power they ſhould ſpeake as Balaams Aſſe.*

And wheras in common ſenſe and reaſon, ſinne muſt be voluntary, not neceſſary; Proteſtants yet anſwere herto, that ſinne muſt be voluntary or free from coaction, but not from neceſſity, euen as the Deuils do neceſſarily do euill, & yet truly ſinne, and the bleſſed Angels do neceſſarily do well, and yet their workes are truly good. But yet this nothing auayleth, for if liberty from coaction would ſuffice, then had beaſtes, Children, and mad-men liberty to ſinne, ſeeing of their owne accord without compulſion they worke. And though the good and euill Angels in reſpect of the laſt end haue only freewill from coaction, yet in regard of the meanes, they haue freewill from neceſſity, becauſe they do many things which are in their power not to do, and of the contrary; And in theſe do the one truly ſinne, and the other do well.

Freewill alſo is proued by ſuch places as teach, that in our actions we are free not only from coaction, but alſo from neceſſity, hauing in our ſelues power and liberty. *He* (23) *that hath determined in his hart, being ſetled, not hauing neceſſity, but hauing power of his owne will, and hath iudged this in his hart, to keepe his Virgin, doth well.* Againe, (24) *Euery one as he hath determined in his hart, not of ſadnes, or of neceſſity, for God loueth a cheerfull giuer.* And to Philemon, (25) *without thy counſaile I would do nothing, that thy good might not be as it were of neceſſity, but voluntary.* But becauſe the words do proue good workes to be voluntary, and free from neceſſity; the Proteſtants of Geneua in their (26) Bibles do add the particle (*quaſi*) and make the Apoſtle to ſay, *but as it were voluntary,* which

(21) 1. Cor. 7. 37.
(24) 2. Cor. 9. 7.
(25) Ver. 14.
(26) Anno 1605. 1610.

which is a groſſe corruption. Peter alſo ſaid to Ananias, (27) *Remayning, did it not remayne to thee, and being ſould, was it not in thy power? why haſt thou put this thing in thy hart?* And S. Paul moſt expreſly of himſelfe ſaid, (28) *Am I not free? &c* (29) *Haue we not power to eate and drinke?* So cleere it is, that man hath freewill from neceſſity.

(27) *Act.* 5. 4.
(28) 1 *Cor.* 9. 1.
(29) 1. *Cor.* 9. 3.

Laſtly, by the denyall of freewill all theſe abſurdities follow. 1. That there remayneth no place for punishment or reward. 2. That all ſhould eyther be good, or all euill: and if all good, not one better then another, and if all euill, not one worſe then another, but all equally either good or euill. 3. That all Exhortations, reprehenſions, prayſe, diſpraiſe, Commandes, Counſailes, threats, promiſes of reward, and the like, were in vayne: then all which, what more abſurd? In regard heerof S. Auſtine ſayth, (30) *Who will not cry out, that it is a foolish thing to giue Commandements to him who hath not freedome to do what is commanded, and that it is iniury to condemne him who had not power to fulfill the Commandements?* Agreably ſayth S. Irenæus, (31) *If therefore it were not in vs, to do theſe things, or not to do them, what cauſe had the Apoſtle, & long before our Lord himſelfe, to counſayle to do certayne things, and to abſtayne from others, but becauſe man had freewill from the beginning?*

(30) *De fide cont. Manich. c. 10.*
(31) *L. 4. c. 78.*

Adde yet heerunto, that moſt certayne, infallible and experimentall Lecture, written with legible letters in the booke of euery mans Conſcience, learned and vnlearned, wherein we plainly read, & by experience know for true, that our Soule doth ſometymes ſtruggle againſt temptation, and happily ouercome the ſame, from whence followeth comfort and peace of Conſcience; but other tymes it yieldeth, when it might haue withſtood, from whence followeth, feare, ſhame, and repentance: none of which would follow, if we had not freewill.

SECT. III.

That the Fathers do expound the Scriptures agreably with Catholickes in proofe of Freewill.

THE former wordes of God to Cain, S. Auſtine expoundeth thus, (1) *Thou ſhalt rule, ouer what, ouer thy brother? not ſo: ouer what then, but ſinne?* S. (2) Ambroſe directly confuteth the applying thereof to Abel, ſaying, *His brother is not giuen vp to him, but his fault is imputed, of which he was cauſer in himſelfe. The fault, ſayth he, is turned vpon thee, which began from thee.* S. Hierome writeth, (3) *Becauſe thou haſt freewill, I warne thee that ſinne haue no dominion ouer thee, but thou ouer Sinne.* Saint Chryſoſtome ſayth, (4) *The Lord of all things hath made our nature to haue freewill &c. he ſuffereth all to lye in the will of him that is ſicke, this therefore is now alſo done in Cain.* Aben Ezra in his Hebrew Commentaries vpon Geneſis, affirmeth it a meere (5) *forgery* to referre the Relatiue otherwiſe then to the word *Sinne.* And heerein the Rabins are ſo cleere, that D. Fulke anſwering thereto, ſayth, (6) *The Iewiſh Rabins erre in this place. &c.* And Caluin acknowledgeth that (7) *There is ſcarce any Expoſitour who doth not referre this to Sinne.*

In like ſort the place of Deutronomy is expounded for freewill, by ancient (8) Philo, ſaying, *God created* (man) *free, that being left to his proper will, he might do whatſoeuer he pleaſed &c. that knowing what was good, what euill, and the difference betweene &c. vertue and vice, he might chooſe the better and fly the worſe: To which ſentence is extant the Oracle in Deutronomy; Behould I haue placed before thee life and death, good and euill, chooſe lyfe.*

S. Cyprian alſo ſaith, (9) *the freedome of beleeuing or not beleeuing to be placed in the will* (is to be ſeene) *in Deutronomy; behould I haue placed before thee lyfe and death, good and euill, chooſe lyfe, that thou mayeſt liue. Alſo in Iſaias, If yee will and will heare me, you ſhall eate the good things of the earth, but if you will not, and will not heare me, the ſword ſhall conſume you. Alſo in the Ghoſpell according to Luke, the Kingdom of God is within you.* S. Baſil writing vpon

(1) *De ciu. Dei. l. 15 c. 7.*
(2) *Ambr. l. 2 de Cain. c. 7.*
(3) *Quæſt. in Gen. & Greg. l. 4. Mor. c. 22. Proſper. lib. 2 de vocat. Gent. c. 13.*
(4) *In Gen. Hom 19. c. 4.*
(5) *In c. 4. 7.*
(6) *Def. of the Engl. Tranſl. p. 310.*
(7) *In Gen. 4. 7.*
(8) *Lib. quòd Deus ſit immutabilis.*
(9) *Lib. 3. ad Quirin. c. 51. And Ambr. in pſ. 40.*

vpon thoſe former wordes of Iſay, *If you will, and will heare me*, ſayth: (10) *In this place eſpecially he ſetteth as it were before our eyes, the liberty of the will to be giuen to mans nature.* And accoꝛding to Epiphanius, (11) *It is manifeſt and cleere to all, and not to be doubted, that God hath giuen freewill vnto vs, ſpeaking by himſelfe, If you will, and will not &c. Wherefore in man it is, to worke good things, or to deſire euill things.* And the ſame Expoſition is giuen by S. Hierome. S. Chriſoſtome alledging thoſe words of Iſay, (12) *If you will, & will heare me &c.* ſaith: (13) *God hath ſayd, If you will, & if you will not, placing in our power vertue & vice, & putting it in our will.* And a litle after, *God ſayth,* (14) *I haue placed before thee fyre and water, lyfe and death, put thy hand whither thou wilt. The Diuell ſayth, is is not placed in thee to ſtretch out thy hand, but this is done by certayne neceſsity and force.* And the ſelfeſame with the Diuell do Prot. ſtill ſay.

(10) In. c. 21 Iſaiæ.
(11) Hær. 16. ad Hier. in c. 3. ad Gal.
(12) Iſa. 1. 19.
(13) Ho. 61. ad Pop. Ant. quæ tit. 2. de fato & Prou.
(14) Eccl. 15. 7.

God, ſaith S. (15) Auſtin, *hath reueyled vnto vs by his holy Scriptures, that in man there is freewill: firſt becauſe Gods Cõmandments themſelues would not profit man, vnles he had freewill, whereby he doing them, might come to the rewards promiſed &c.* (16) *God from the beginning made man, and left him, in the hand of his owne Counſayle &c. He hath ſet before thee water and fire, to which thou wilt ſtretch forth thy hand. Before man there is lyfe and death, good and euill, what pleaſeth him ſhalbe giuen him. Behould we ſee moſt plainly expreſſed the free power of mans will. Wherefore is it, that in ſo many places God commaundeth all his Commandements to be kept and done? How doth he command, if there be not freewill?* And then cyting to this end, ſeuerall other places he cõcludeth, *what do infinit ſuch other places in the old Teſtament ſhew, but the free power of mans will? If it were not in our power* (ſayth (17) Irenæus, *to do theſe things, or not to do them, what cauſe had the Apoſtles, and much before him our Lord himſelfe, to counſayle to do certayne things, and to abſtayne from others, but becauſe frõ the beginning man hath freewill?*

(15) De Grat. & lib. Arb. c. 2. & Tertul. l. 2. cont. Marcion. c. 5.
(16) Eccl. 15. 14.
(17) L. 4. c. 72.

Origen cyting this Text, *And now Iſrael, what doth thy Lord God require from thee?* addeth, (18) *Let them be aſhamed of theſe wordes, who deny freewill in man. How ſhould God require from man, vnles Man had in his power, what he ought to offer to God requiring?* And in another place, (19) *the Scriptures impugne this vnderſtanding, declaring that there is freewill, both whileſt they accuſe*

(18) Ho. 12. in Numeros.
(19) In Mat. c. 13.

accuſe thoſe that ſinne, and allow thoſe who do well.

But none writeth more plainly then S. Cyprian, ſaying (20) Turning to his Apoſtles he ſayd, (21) What will you alſo depart? obſerving indeed the law, whereby man left to his owne liberty, and placed in his owne will, deſireth to himſelfe either death or ſaluation.

(20) Ep ad Cornel. ante med.
(21) Io. 6. 67.

S. Hierome affirmeth that, (22) That which is ſayd in the Goſpell (23) A good tree cannot yield euill fruite, is not referred to the propriety of nature, as hereſikes would, but to the will of the mind. laſtly it is inferred, Or make yee a good tree, and the fruite thereof good; whereby it is plaine, that euery one by his owne will doth make to his Soule a good or euill tree, whoſe fruites are different.

(22) In Iſa. c. 55.
(23) Mat. 7. 18.

Theodoret auoucheth in generall that, (24) Whoſoeuer will, may eaſily find many other places of that kind, both in the Goſpels, & in the monuments of the Apoſtles, by which is plainly ſhewed the abſolute will, and free power of man.

(24) De curationes Infidelium Græcorum, Ser. 5. de natura hominis.

S. Gregory reconcileth the concourſe of Gods Grace & mans freewill in theſe wordes, (25) Piety from aboue doth preuent, worke ſomething in vs, without vs, that our freewill alſo following may worke with vs the good that we deſire, which yet, by Grace beſtowed, at the laſt Iudgement he doth ſo reward in vs, as if it had proceeded from vs alone: becauſe Gods goodnes doth preuent vs to make vs Innocents. Paul ſayth, (26) By the Grace of God, I am that which I am. And becauſe our freewill followeth that Grace, he addeth, And his Grace in me hath not beene voyd, but I haue laboured more abundantly then all they: who when he ſaw that he was nothing of himſelfe, he ſayth, but not I. And yet becauſe he found that he was ſomething with Grace, be annexed, but the Grace of God with me. For he would not ſay, with me, if with preuenient Grace he had not freewill following. That therfore he might ſhow himſelfe to be nothing without Grace, he ſaith, not I, but that he might ſhow that by freewill he worked with Grace, be added, But the Grace of God with me.

(25) Mor. l. 16. c. 22.
(26) 1. Cor. 15. 10.

Finally, the Fathers are ſo cleare for freewill, that Caluin (27) reprehendeth for the ſame the Greeke and Latin Fathers in Generall. And other Prot. ſay that, (28) The Errour of freewill deryued from Iuſtine Martyr and Irenæus, was at the tyme of the Nycene Councell in ſome rypenes &c. We know that euer ſince the Apoſtles tymes in a manner it flouriſhed euery where, till Martin

(27) Inſtit. l. 2. c. 2. ſect. 4. & l. 3. c. 3. ſect 11 And ſee Whiteg. Def. p. 472.
(28) Diſcouery of vntruthes in D Bancroftes Ser. moon p. 14.

Luther

Luther tooke in hand the ſword againſt it. The Centuriſts thinke that, (29) *Scarcely there is any point of Doctrine which began ſo ſoone to be darkned as this of freewill:* And (30) *after the ſame manner Clemens query where aſſ meth freewill, that it may appeare, that not only all the Doctours of that age were in ſuch darknes, but alſo that the ſame increaſed afterwards in the later ages.* And the like is conteſted by (31) Whiteguift. By all which we ſee, that the Fathers did not only beleeue Freewill, but alſo proued the ſame from ſeuerall cleere Texts of the ſacred Scriptures.

(29) Cent. 2. c. 4. Col. 58.
(30) Ib. col. 59.
(31) Def. p. 472. 473.

SECT. IV.

That ſundry Proteſtant writers do teach, and defend our Catholicke Doctrine of Freewill.

IOhn Huſſe teacheth that, (1) *Though grace, which maketh a man gratefull, is had by the guift of God, yet efficiently it is had from freewill conſenting: for S. Auſtine ſaith, He that created thee without thee, will not iuſtify thee without thee. This grace is, (or proceedeth) from 3. Cauſes, from God as principally working, from Grace freely giuen ſtirring vp the freewill, and from Freewill as conſenting.*

(1) Ia. 1. Cor. c. 7.

Bullinger affi meth that, (2) *God appointeth vs lawes, and layeth before vs rewards and punishments, he commandeth vs to imbrace the good and eſchew the euill, to the performing wherof he doth neither deny vs his Grace &c. nor deſpiſe our good will.* And, (3) *The Lord requireth our endeauour, which notwithſtanding is not without his aſſiſtance and grace.*

(2) Decades English. p. 481.
(3) Ib. p. 646.
(4) Synop. p. 8. 8. 810.

Willet hauing reproued Hemingius a Lutheran, and Snecanus a Caluiniſt, for their Doctrine of *freewill*, affirmeth of them and their followers that, (4) *They are more erroneous concerning Freewill then are the Papiſtes.* And whereas S. (5) Auſtine and S. (6) Chriſoſtome do condemne the Manichees for denying freewill, Hemingius coupleth his Prot. Brethren with the ſayd Manichees, ſaying, (7) *Certtaine Deuines of great name and otherwiſe excellently deſerning of the Church of Chriſt, whome as Brethren in Chriſt I loue, drawing moſt neare*

(5) De fide cont. Manich. c. 9. 10. 14. & in Actis cum Felice Manich. l. 2. c. 4.
(6) In Ioh. ho. 42.
(7) De Vniuerſ. Grat. p. 10 109. 107.

to the Manichees and Stoickes, do from the ſame principle build their opinion of freewill, and other euents. Hence ſome are not affrayde to inferre, that God ordained the Adultery of Dauid.

Other Prot. charge Melanchon with teaching *freewill*, (8) and, *making our aſſent cooperating with the word and holy Ghoſt.* And Melanchon himſelf ſaith, (9) *Three cauſes of a good action concur, the word of God, the holy Ghoſt, & mans will aſſenting or reſiſting the word of God &c. The furies of the Manichees are not to be admitted. The Converſion in Dauid is not made, as if a ſtone ſhould be changed into a fig, but the freewill in Dauid doth ſomething, when he heard the chiding and promiſe, willing then, and freely he confeſſeth his ſinne, and his will doth ſomething.*

(8) *See Morgenſt. tract. de Eccleſia. p. 6. Schluſſelb. in Theol. Calu. l. 2. f. 86.*

(9) *Loc. com. cap. de lib. Arb.*

Foxe reporteth how that one (10) *Trew*, and ſundry other Proteſtant Profeſſours of thoſe tymes taught freewill, and were as then by their other Brethren, (11) *called the Freewill men.* And though M. Parkins in words impugneth freewill, yet in conſequence of truth he acknowedgeth the Doctrine, teaching that, (12) *Becauſe God giues men Commandement to repent and beleeue, therefore they haue power to repent and beleeue:* (13) *God with the Commandement giuing Grace, that the thing preſcribed may be done.*

(10) *Act. & Mon. p. 1533. 1605.*

(11) *Ib. p. 1605.*

(12) *Reform. Cath p. 26.*

(13) *Ib. p. 52.*

Caluin writing vpon theſe words of Ioſue (14) *Feare our Lord and ſerue him, &c. but if it lyke you not to ſerue our Lord, choyce is giuen you, chooſe this day that which pleaſeth you &c.* expoundeth them thus: (15) *Not without cauſe gaue he them liberty of choyce, that being tyed by their owne conſent, they could not pretend, that, that which they did, they did of neceſſity, and could not but do it.* So plentifull are our Prot. in teaching from the Scriptures, the Doctrine of Freewill.

(14) *Ioſ. 24. 24.*

(15) *In Ioſ. 24. 15. Edit. Gal.*

SECT. V.

Obiections from Scripture againſt Freewill anſwered.

(1) Rogers Def. of the Art. art. 10. p. 48.

(2) 2. Cor. 3. 5.

SOme (1) obiect that, (2) *we are not ſufficient of our ſelues to thinke any thinge as of our ſelues, but our ſufficiency is of God.* And againe

againe (5) *No man can come to me, vnles the Father that ſent me draw him.* Anſw. We do not defend freedome or ſufficiency of our will by nature, but by aſſiſtance of Grace, which as I haue proued before, God offereth to all men: which ſuppoſed, the former texes make directly for vs, affirming our ſufficiency, and only withall teaching, that this ſufficiency is not of our ſelues, that is, not by force of nature, but of God, that is, through Grace, which is the very doctrine we teach. This ſame anſwere will alſo ſerue for the ſecond text, only I will adde, what S. Chriſoſtome ſaith to the Manichees obiecting the ſame text, (5) *No man can come to me, except my Father that ſent me draw him. Here the Manichees ryſe vp, contending by teſtimony of this text, that we can do nothing of our ſelues; But this taketh not away our freewill, but sheweth that it needeth Gods help.* And afterwards, (6) *Wherfore it is euident, that it is in our choice, whether we will be ſaued or damned.*

(5) Io.6 44.

(5) *In Io. ho.* 45.

(6) *Ibid. ho.* 46.

It is alſo obiected (7) that, (8) *It is God that worketh in you both to will and to accompliſh.* Anſw. True it is, that God doth worke, but we alſo do by his Grace cooperate, accordingly as immediatly before it is ſaid, (9) *With feare and trembling worke your Saluation:* And ſo M. Perkins confeſſeth that, (10) *Mans freewill concurs with Grace as a Co-worker.* And that, (11) *being moued by Grace, it acteth and moueth it ſelfe.* And thus doth S. Auſtine anſwere this very obiection, ſaying, (12) *For not becauſe he ſaid, It is God that worketh in you, both to will, and to accompliſh according to his good will therfore is he to be thought to haue taken away freewil: for if it were ſo he would not haue ſaid before with feare and trembling worke your ſaluation; for when there is command that they worke, their freewill is called vpon.*

(7) Rogers Def of the Art. art. 10. p. 30.

(8) *Philip.* 2. 13.

(9) *Philip.* 2. 12.

(10) *Ref. Cath. p.* 14.

(11) *Ib. p.* 16.

(12) *Tom.* 7. *de Grat. & lib. Arb. c.* 9.

It is alſo further vrged that we are ſaid to be (13) *Dead by ſinne*, and ſo no power in our Will, to will ſpirituall actions: But the ſame place likewiſe affirmeth, *that we are quickned in Chriſt, by whoſe grace* (we) *are ſaued.* And therfore although not of our ſelues, yet by his quickning and preuenting grace, we are ſufficiently holpen and enabled to worke.

(13) *Eph.* 2. 5.

Some obiect thoſe words of Chriſt, (14) *It is neceſſary that ſcandals do come.* And, (15) *It is impoſſible that ſcandals ſhould*

(14) *Mat.* 18. 7.

(15) *Luc.* 17. 1.

not

not come, and the like. Anſw. S. Chriſoſtome anſwereth theſe very places ſaying, (16) *When he calleth it ſo neceſsity, he ſaith it not, becauſe the Will may take away liberty, and power of Freewill, nor becauſe it may ſubiect mans lyfe to the neceſsity of things; but becauſe it is certainly to come to paſſe, he foretelleth it Which Luke expreſſeth in other wordes. It is impoſsible that ſcandals ſhould not come &c. not the foretelling therfore therof is to be thought to bring ſcandals; for they do not therfore come, becauſe he foretold ſcandals would be, but becauſe they were certainly to come, therfore he foretould them.*

(16) Ho 60. in Math & ho.27. in 1. Cor. See S. Aug. de Ciu. Dei l.5.c.10.

(17) Luc.14. 23.

Others vrge thoſe wordes of the Parable, (17) *The Lord ſaid to the Seruants, Goe forth into the waies and hedges, and compell them to enter.* Anſw. The vehement perſuaſion that God vſeth both externally by words and miracles, and internally by his grace, to bring vs vnto him, is called compelling, not that he forceth any againſt their owne willes, but that he mollifyeth a hard hart, making him willing, that before would not. S. Auſtine (18) referreth this compelling to the penall lawes, which Catholicke Princes do iuſtly vſe againſt Heretickes and Schiſmaticks: And ſo in this ſenſe, by the two former partes of the Parable, the Iewes firſt, and ſecondly the Gentiles, that neuer beleiued before in Chriſt, were inuited by faire ſweet meanes only: but by the third, ſuch are inuited, as the Church of God hath power ouer, becauſe they promiſed in Baptiſme.

(18) Ep. 50. & 204. & l.1 cont. Ep. Gaud. c.25.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXXII.

The true State of the Queſtion, concerning the poſſibility of keeping Gods Commandements.

Whether the Commandementes of Godt, hrough his holy Grace, though not by the only power of Freewill, are poſsible to be kept by iuſt men in this lyfe: or rather that they are ſo impoſsible, that in euery worke that men do, they tranſgreſſe them.

SECT. I.

Catholike Doctrine.

SAINT Auſtine ſayd exceeding well that, (1) *God who is iuſt cannot command any thing impoſsible, nor he that is holy, will damne man for that which he cannot eſchew:* Yea, (2) *We accurſe* (ſayth he) *the blaſpemy of them who affirme any thing impoſsible to be commanded by God:* According to which the Catholicke Church decreeth, that (3) *No man though iuſtifyed ought to thinke himſelfe free from the keeping of the Commandements No man ought to vſe that temerarious ſpeach, and forbidden by the Fathers vnder Anathema the Commandments of God to be impoſsible to be kep by a man iuſtified: for God doth not command impoſsible things, but by commanding doth admonish to do what thou canſt, and to aſk*

(1) *De Temp. Ser. 61.*

(2) *De Temp. Ser. 191.*

(3) *Concil. Trid. Seſſ. 6. c. 11.*

aske what thou canſt not, and he helpeth that thou mayeſt &c. And although the moſt holy and iuſt in this mortall lyfe do ſometymes fall, at leaſt into light and dayly Sinnes, which alſo are called venall, yet they do not therefore ceaſe to be iuſt. And therefore, (4) *If any ſhall ſay, that the Commandements of God are impoſſible to be kept by a man iuſtifyed, and in the ſtate of Grace &c.* or that (5) *Nothing is commanded in the Ghoſpell but fayth, other things are indifferent, neyther commanded nor prohibited but free; or that the ten Commandements do not pertayne to Chriſtians, Anathema.*

(4) Seſſ. 6. Can. 18.

(5) Can. 19.

In the ſecond Councell Arauſicanum it is ordayned, that, (6) *According to Catholicke Fayth we believe, that Grace receyued by Baptiſme, all ſuch as are baptized, Chriſt helping & cooperating, may, and ought to fulfill, if they will labour faythfully, thoſe things that belong to Salvation.*

(6) Cap. 25.

In the ſecond Mileuitane Councell it is defyned, that, (7) *Whoſoeuer ſhall ſay, that the Grace of God, doth in this only help vs not to ſinne, becauſe by it the vnderſtanding of the Commandements is reueyled and opened vnto vs, that ſo we may know what we ought to deſire or eſchew, but that by it is not giuen vs that, what we know to be done, we may loue, and be able to do, Anathema.*

(7) Cap. 4.

All (8) Catholickes with one conſent teach, that the Commandments of God are poſſible to be kept by iuſt mē, not by the only power and ſtrength of Freewill, as heretikes do calumniate; but by the help of Gods grace, and the ſpirit of Fayth and Charity infuſed in their Iuſtification.

(8) Bellar. de Iuſtif. l. 4. c. 10 Rhem. Teſt. in 1. 10. 3.

Pointes Diſputable.

Some (9) Schoolmen thinke, that Chriſtians are not only freed from the Ceremoniall law, and from the guilt & terrour of the morall law, but alſo from all the law written in the bookes of Moyſes, not that we are not bound to keep the law of Moyſes, as it is naturall, and as it is renewed in the Ghoſpell, in the Epiſtles of the Apoſtles, but as it is written by Moyſes himſelfe: yet (10) others thinke that the morall law euen as it was giuen by Moyſes & the Prophets, & and ſo as it is written in the Bookes of the Old Teſtament, truly to oblige Chriſtians.

(9) Dom. à Soto. l. 2. de Iuſt. & Iur. q. 5. art. 4.

(10) Bellar. de Iuſtif. l. 4. c. 6.

Prote-

Proteſtant vntruthes.

If you will beliene Luther, (11) *The Papiſtes teach that man by his owne force of nature, without Grace, may keep the Commandements of God. My maiſter Occam writteth, that the ſacred Scriptures do no where teſtify, that for the keeping of Gods commandements the ſingular guift of God is neceſſary.* Melanchon demaundeth, (12) *What difference betweene the Pelagians, and our Aduerſaries? Seeing both thinke, that men without the holy Ghoſt may loue God & keepe Gods commandements according to the Subſtance of the actions, merit grace and Iuſtification by workes, which things reaſon it ſelf doth without the holy Ghoſt. How many abſurdities followe of theſe Pelagian opinions, vvhich are taught in Schooles vvith a loud voyce.* But theſe are meere fictions of Luther, and Melanchon.

Proteſtant Doctrine.

Luther teacheth, that (13) *So many Teſtimonies of Scripture proue the Commandments to be impoſsible to vs, that nothing is more manifeſt.* And, (14) *Thou doſt moſt badly, denying our Sauiour to Command things impoſsible: but thou doſt worſe then moſt badly, in that thou dareſt call this a falshood, We cannot in this lyfe fullfill the Commandements of God.* Yea ſayth Melanchon, (15) *When the Law commandeth God to be loued, it commandeth a thing as impoſsible, as if it should command vs to fly ouer Caucaſus.* Whitaker affirmeth, that it is the foundation of Chriſtian Religion, that (16) *The law of God cannot be performed, and fullfilled by vs.* Perkins (17) *The Papiſts thinke that men in this life may keep, & fullfill the law.* Danæus, (18 *Bellarmine anſwereth, It is eaſy for him who hath Charity to fulfill the law. I anſwere, yea it is impoſsible for him.*

Adamus Franciſci: (19) *Although men regenerate be holpen and guided by the holy Ghoſt, yet by the relickes of ſinne they are hindered, that they cannot ſatisfy the law.* Caluin. (20) *No man fulfilleth the law, nor euer hath fulfilled it.* (21) *They cannot produce any one who hath fullfilled the law, and the ſame is taught by ſundry others.*

Luther, (22) *God requireth that we loue him with all our hart, which thing no mortall man can do.* Caluin, (23) *I ſay, there was*

(11) *Ad lib. Ducis Georg. ſcript. Anno 1533.*
(12) *In Apol. c. de Tradit. humanis.*
(13) *In Conf. Rationis Latomianæ.*
(14) *Luth. in Reſp. ad Dial. Silueſtri Priuatis.*
(15) *Ad c. 4. Ep. ad Rom. Calu. Inſtit. l. 2. c. 7.*
(16) *Controu. 2. q. 8. c. 3. p. 103.*
(17) *Tom. 2. of Bap. fol. 833.*
(18) *Controu. 5. p. 947.*
(19) *Margarit. Theol. loc. 5. p. 52.*
(20) *In Rom. 13. 8.*
(21) *Inſtit. l. 3. c. 17. §. 13.*
(22) *Luther. Tom. 5 in Gal. 3. fol 343. Confeſſ. Sect. art 15.*
(23) *Inſtit. l. 2. c. 7. § 1. Brentius ho. 1. in Dom. 13.*

no Saint, who compaſed with the body of Death, attayned to the end (or height) of loue, that he loued God from his whole ſoule, from his whole hart, from his whole power. And the ſame is taught by ſundry others. Wherefore according to Prot. No man hath euer kept the Commandements, nor poſſibly can.

poſt Trin. p 777. Damæus Cõtrou. 5 p. 974. Paræus de iuſtif. l. 4. c. 11 p. 1073.

Proteſtantes agree with Ancient Heretickes.

This daungerous Doctrine of the impoſſibility of keeping Gods Commandementes, was condemned in certaine Hereticks by S. Hierome, ſaying, *We* (24) *accurſe the Blaſphemy of them who ſay, that any thing impoſſible is commanded by God to man.* And the ſame words vſeth S. (25) Auſtine. In ſo much that Holman in great diſcontent herof ſaith, (26) *Hierome writes, Let him be accurſed who hath ſaid, God to haue Commanded impoſſible things: but why is not Hierome rather accurſed, who ſo audacioußy thinketh againſt God?* And the like diſlike of this Cenſure of S. Hierome, is ſhewed by (27) Luther, the Centuriſtes, and Caluin. For the ſame errour S. (28) Epiphanius taxeth Ptolomæus.

(14) In Explan Symb. ad Damaſ.
(15) De Temp. Ser. 191.
(16) Comment. de Pœna l. 1 fol. 55.
(17) Tom. 2. Wittemb. fol 210. Cent. 4 Col. 1248.
Calu. inſt. l. 2. c. 7. § 3.
(18) Hær. 33.

Proteſtant Errours.

We (29) *deny* (ſayth Caluin) *Chriſt to be a Law-giuer, who gaue any new lawes to the world.* (30) *Chriſt bringeth not new lawes.* And the ſelfſame is taught by ſundry other (31) Proteſtants.

Luther writeth that, (32) *When it is thus taught, Faith in Chriſt iuſtifyeth, but withall the Commandements of God ought to be kept, becauſe it is written: If thou wilt enter into lyfe keep the Commandements; there forthwith Chriſt is denyed, and faith abolished, becauſe that is aſcribed to the Commandements, or the law, which belongeth to God alone.* Agayne (33) *Only faith is neceſſary, that yt may be iuſt, all other things are moſt free, neyther commanded nor forbidden &c. If thy Conſcience tell thee thou haſt ſinned, anſwer, I haue ſinned: Therefore God will punish, and damne thee? No. But the law ſayth ſo. But I haue nothing to do with the law, Wherefore? Becauſe I haue liberty.* And, (34) *It is altogether manifeſt that the ten Commandements were giuen only to the Iewes, not to vs.* (35)

(19) In Ansid. Concil. Trident. Seſſ. 6. Can 21. p. 291.
(20) In Mat. 5. 43.
(21) Beza in Mat. 19. 19. & in 2 Cor. 3. 6 & in. 1. Ioan. 2. 7.
Pet. Mart. in Rom. 3.
Powel. in Ep. Dedic. of things indifferent.
(22) In Comment. ad c. 2. ad Gal.
(23) Ibid.

We

We neyther ought nor will ſuffer one very law, or one preceipt of Moyſes (34) *to be layd vpon our neckes.* (36) *Be carefull that thou be wyſe, and command Moyſes with his law to depart a farre off, and to go to the miſchiefe. Be nothing moued with his terrour and threats, but alwayes ſuſpect him as the worſt Hereticke, a man accurſed and condamned, and worſe then Pope, or the Diuell himſelfe.* And yet in another place he acknowledgeth that, (37) *Moyſes reiected, therwithall Chriſt alſo is reiected.* Againe, (38) *Let the ten Commandements of God be quite taken away, and all hereſies will ceaſe: for the ten Commandementes are the fountaine, from whence as from the ſpring all hereſies do flow, for the ſacred Scripture is the booke of all Heretickes.* Now whereas Luther thus affirmed, that, (39) *The Decalogue pertaineth nothing to Chriſtians*, Whitaker ſaith herof, (40) *This Article is truly moſt worthy of Luther, for it containeth a greateſt truth and comfort.* So that the greateſt comfort to a Prot. is to quite take away Gods Commandements And the good reaſon herof is giuen by Tyndall ſaying, (41) *Thou oweſt nothing to God but faith, that thou mayeſt confeſſe Chriſt Ieſus, and beliewe him to haue riſen from the dead: For ſo thou ſhalt be ſaued, In all other things God hath made it free to thee, that thou mayeſt follow thine owne will.* Though it be to murder, adulterate, ſteale &c.

(34) *Tom. 5. Ger. Wit. in Comment. Exod. 20. fol.*
(35) *Tom 2. Ger. Wit. in Gal. 3. fol. 273.*
(36) *In Gal. 4 fol. 215.*
(37) *Tom. 2. Ger. Ien. l. de abuſu Miſſæ. fol 39.*
(38) *In Colloq. ſub. de Fanaticis. fol. 149.*
(39) *Serm. de Moyſe.*
(40) *Cont. Dur. l. 8 ſect. 91.*
(41) *In Calumno-Turciſ. l. 4. c 22.*

M. Rogers confeſſeth of (42) *Ioannes Ibebius and his followers the Antinomies, that they will not haue Gods law to be preached, nor the Conſcience of ſinners to be terrified and troubled with the Iudgments of God. Of Baniſter, (among our ſelues) who hold how it is vtterly euill for the elect ſo much as to thinke, much leſſe to ſpeake, or heare of the feare of God, which the law preacheth.*

(42) *Def. of the Artic. 7. p. 391.*
(43) *2. Part. Reſp. ad Act. Colloq. Montisbelg p. 216. See Calu. in Act. 15. 10.*
(44) *In theſ. lib. 2. p. 200.*
(45) *Ib. p 201*
(46) *Loc. 12. p. 172.*
(47) *Tom. 2. in cap. 20. Gen. f. 244.*

According to Beza, (43) *God commandeth ſomething, which he would not haue done, and promiſeth alſo ſomething which he will not performe.* Piſcator ſaith, (44) *God ſometimes by his word doth ſignifye that himſelfe willeth that, which truly he willeth not, or that he willeth not that which truly he willeth.* And, from (45) hence *we may perceiue, that there is a certaine holy diſſimulation, euen lawfull to men, much more to God the moſt free agent.* And in another place he affirmeth, (46) *that Chriſt diſſembled.* Not vnlike to Luther, who feareth not to giue Chriſt the lye, in theſe words: (47) *That which they call an officiously, is alſo aſſigned for the*

preſt of our Neighbour: ſo Chriſt in Luke faigned himſelfe to go further. And thus Prot. are content to allow of lying, and moſt blaſphemouſly to aſcribe it to Chriſt himſelfe, but yet according to the tendernes of their Conſciences, they cannot indure in any reſpect Æquiuocation in men, though vpon iuſt cauſes.

SECT. II.

It is proued by Scriptures, that the Commandements of God through his holy Grace, are poſſible to be kept by man in this lyfe.

THe Scriptures teach, that the Commandements are not only poſſible, but alſo eaſy to be kept, (1) *My yoake is ſweet and my burden light:* (2) *His Commandements are not heauy.* To anſwere that they are not heauy, becauſe God doth not impute them, is all one to affirme, that a man at euery foote falling vnder a heauy burden, yet the ſaid burden is eaſy, becauſe he hath a Cōpanion to help him vp againe: which is moſt abſurd, and directly contrary to the Apoſtle, affirming of the Commandements themſelues, *that they are not heauy.* In which ſenſe king Dauid ſaid, (3) *I ranne the way of thy Commandements when thou didſt dilate my hart.* And the ſame alſo is forteould by Ezechiel, (4) *I will put my Spirit in the midſt of you, and I will make that you walke in my Preceps, and keep my Iudgments, and do them.*

(1) *Mat.11. 30.*
(2) *1.Io.5.3.*
(1) *Pſ.118.32.*
(4) *36.27.*

The Scriptures alſo teach, that in this life we may fulfill the law, do the will of God, and obey Chriſt, (5) *God ſending his ſonne &c. that the iuſtification of the law might be fulfilled in vs:* theſe words proue, that the Law iuſtifyeth, and that it may be fulfilled in vs, by Chriſts Grace. We are alſo taught to pray that, (6) *The will of God may be done in Earth, as it is in heauen.* Now it is the will of God, that we keep his Commandements. And Chriſt (7) *is made to all that obey him, cauſe of eternall Salvation.* Theſe places are ſo conuincing, that Scharpius is inforced to giue this abſurdeſt anſwere, *From theſe places*

(5) *Rom.8.4.*
(6) *Mat.6. 10.*
(7) *Heb.5.9.*
(8) *De Iuſtif. Controu.12. p.191.*

ges nothing followeth, but that the faithfull fulfil the Law of God: but it followeth not, that they fulfill it in this lyfe. As though it were not more then cleere, that the forſaid texts do ſpeake of our Iuſtification, obedience, and fulfilling the law, and will of God in this life.

The Commandements are kept by louing God and our Neighbours, (9) *If you loue me keep my Commandementes:* And, (10) *He that loueth his Neighbour hath fulfilled the law:* But we all ought, and may loue God and our Neighbour, for otherwiſe we cannot be Chriſtes Diſciples and friends, himſelfe ſaying, (11) *In this all men ſhall know, that you are my Diſciples if you haue loue one to another.* (12) *You are my friends if you do the things that I command you.* And, (13) *This is my Preſept, that you loue one another.* To anſwere, that none can loue as they ought and are bound, is to exclude all from being Chriſtes friends and Diſciples. But beſides, God requireth nothing elſe in loue, but that we loue with all our harts, which not only to be poſſible, but alſo indeed to be practiſed in the tyme of the New Teſtament, the Scriptures teſtify. (14) *God will circumciſe thy hart, and the hart of thy ſeed, that thou mayeſt loue the Lord thy God, with all thyne hart, and with all thy Soule.* Yea they further witnes, that we may be perfect, and ſo perfectly loue, for Charity is the bond of Perfection, (15) *Noe was a iuſt and perfect man:* (16) *Walke before me and be perfect*, and ſundry ſuch lyke.

The Scriptures do exemplify this in diuers who kept the Commandements: of Iob it is ſaid, *that* (18) *he was a man ſimple and right, and fearing God, and departing from euill.* Of Dauid God ſayth, (19) *He kept my Commandements, and followed me in all his hart, doing that which was well liked in my ſight.* Of Ioſias it is written, (20) *Like vnto him was there no King before him, that returned to our Lord in all his hart, and in all his Soule, & in all his power, according to all the law of Moyſes.* Of Ioſue we read that, (21) *As our Lord had commanded Moyſes &c. ſo did Moyſes commend Ioſue, and he accompliſhed all things: he omitted not of all the Commandements, not ſo much as one word whith our Lord had commanded Moyſes.* Of Zacharias and S. Elizabeth S. Luke teſtifyeth that, (22) *They were both iuſt before God, walking in all*

(9) *Io.* 14. 15.
(10) *Rom.* 13. 8. *Gal.* 5. 14.
(11) Io. 13. 35.
(12) *Io.* 15. 14.
(13) Io. 15. 12.
(14) *Deut.* 30. 6.
(15) *Gen.* 6. 9.
(16) *Gen.* 17. 1.
(17) *Mat.* 5. 48. & 19. 21. *Philip.* 3. 15.
(18) C. 1. 18.
(19) 3. *Reg.* 14. 8. & 15. 5. *Act.* 13. 22.
(20) 4. *Reg.* 23. 25.
(21) *Ioſ.* 11. 15. See *Eccl.* 44. 20.
(22) C. 1. 6.

all the Commandements and Iuſtifications of our Lord without blame.

(23) *In hunc locum.*

Caluin in anſwere to this only ſaith, (23) *I anſwere thoſe praiſes wherwith the ſeruants of God are ſo higly honoured, are to be taken with exception.* But Caluin doth not find in all the Scriptures, that this exception is to be from keeping the Commandementes.

(24) *Luc.20.6.*

Becauſe theſe wordes, (24) *They were both iuſt before God walking in all the Commandements, and Iuſtifications of our Lord without blame,* do help to proue workes to iuſtify. Beza vpon the ſame place though he confeſſe *δικαιωμα* (which Greeke word S. Luke vſeth) to be tranſlated according to the word *iuſtificationes*, yet he reiecteth this interpretation, that (ſaith he) *I might cut off this occaſion of calumniating Iuſtification by Faith* (alone). And for *Iuſtifications*, he tranſlateth, *rites.* Him heerein the Engliſh Proteſtants follow in the Kings Bible.

(25) *Luc.18. 18.*

S. Luke relateth, (25) *A certaine Prince asked our Sauiour ſaying, By doing what ſhall I poſſeſſe lyfe euerlaſting? And Ieſus ſaid &c. Thou knoweſt the Commandementes: Thou ſhalt not kill &c. Who ſaid, All theſe things haue I kept from my youth.* (26) *And Ieſus beholding him loued him &c.* To anſwere as Proteſtantes do, that this young man diſſembled or lyed, theſe laſt words of S. Marke, *Beholding him, loued him,* will no waies permit.

(26) *Mar.10. 21.*

(27) *Lib.3.de Iuſtif.c.12. p.812.*

But Paræus further anſwereth, that, (27) *The Lord remitteth him to the workes of the Law, not that he thinketh this way of Saluation to be poſſible, but that he might confound his Hypocriſy:* ſo making Chriſt to thinke one thing and ſpeake the contrary. But Brentius proceedeth yet further, affirming that, (28) *Chriſt anſwered thus, that he might rather ſhow him the way to eternall damnation. Which anſwere* (ſaith (29) Paræus) *is no leſſe true, then that ſentence of the Apoſtle: You are made voyd from Chriſt, who are iuſtifyed by the Law.* So making Chriſt to direct the yong man to Hell, who deſired to learne of him the way to heauen. Luther alſo anſwering to the ſame place, ſaith, (30) *I vnderſtand this place in generall, that this ſaying of Chriſt, Do this and thou ſhalt liue, is a certaine mocking and ſcoffing.* Herof alſo ſaith Paræus, (31) *Luthers ſcoffing may be defended.* And (32) *It was indeed a ſerious conference, but that nothing hindreth a ſcoffe to be mingled*

(28) *Apud Paræum.ibid l.4.c.2. p.965.*

(29) *Ib. p. 967.*

(30) *Tom.5.in Gal. 3. fol. 347.*

(31) *De iuſtif. l.4.c.2.p.967.*

(32) *Ib.p.969.*

mingled by the Lord. And wheras Christ ſaid, *Yet one thing is wanting to thee, ſell all that thou haſt, and giue to the poore:* Beza (33) anſwereth to the contrary; *Yea all things* (are wanting) *ſeeing no man can obſerue one Commandement ſo, as the Law preſcribeth. Christ therfore ſpeaketh with a certaine holy Ironia, or ſcoffing.* So impudent are theſe Heretickes to make Christ a ſcoffer: And ſo vnanſwerable is this text for the keeping of the Commandements. (33) *In hunc locum.*

Reaſon alſo conuinceth this truth; for firſt we may do more then God commandeth, (as is proued (34) hertofore) therfore much more that which he commandeth. 2. If the Commandements were impoſſible to be kept, they could not bynd, and conſequently were not precepts, for it is not imaginable, that any can ſinne in that which he cannot eſchew. 3. God herby is made more cruell, and vnwiſe then any tyrant, who ſhould exact ſuch a tribute of his very friēds, as they could not poſſibly pay, and would enact ſuch lawes vnder greateſt penaltie, as he certainly forſaw were impoſſible to be kept. 4. Christ teacheth vs to pray, (35) *Thy will be done as in heauen, in earth alſo:* here we deſire grace to fulfill the will and Commandements of God, which if it were impoſſible, the Prayer were fruitles, and idle. (34) *See hertofore Chap. 12.* (35) *Mat. 6. 10.*

SECT. III.

The Fathers do expound the Scriptures in proofe, that the Commandements are poſſible to be kept.

SAint Baſil hauing alleadged theſe wordes of S. Paul. (1) *Be ye therefore followers of God as moſt deare Children, & walke in loue &c.* teacheth that, (2) *without doubt he who is good and iuſt would not haue commanded this, vnles he had giuen power wherewith we ſhould do it.* And vpon theſe wordes of Moyſes; *Attend to thy ſelfe*, he affirmeth that, (3) *It is impious to affirme the Commandements of the holy Ghoſt to be impoſſible to be kept.* (1) *Eph. 5. 1.* (2) *In Regulis breu. Reſp. 176.* (3) *Hom. in illud Moyſes, Attende.*

S. Hierome writing vpon that ſaying of Christ, *Loue your Enemies*, ſayth, (4) *Many meaſuring the Precepts of God by* (4) *Ad. 1. 5. Mat.*

their owne weaknes not by the ſtrength of holy men, do thinke thoſe things to be impoſsible which are commanded &c. But we are to know, that Chriſt doth not Command things impoſsible, but perfect, which Dauid did in Saul and Abſolom. Steuen the Martyr prayed for his enemies ſtoning him: and Paul deſired to be accurſed for his Perſecutors.

(5) De Nat. & Gra. c. 69.

S. Auſtine teacheth that, (5) *In that it is firmly believed, that God who is iuſt and good, could not command things impoſsible, hence we are admoniſhed what to do in eaſy things, and what to aske in hard things, for all things are eaſy to Charity, to which alone Chriſtes burden is eaſy, or that alone is the burden it ſelfe which is eaſy: according to this it is ſaid, His Commandements are not heauy.* Againe, (6) *But ſome may ſay, I can by no meanes loue my Enemies. In all the Scriptures God telleth thee, that thou canſt. Thou of the contrary anſwereſt, thou canſt not. Conſider now whether God, or thou art to be believed. And therfore becauſe truth cannot lye, let humane frailty leaue of her vaine excuſes: becauſe he can neither command any thing impoſsible, who is iuſt; nor damne man for that which he could not eſchew, who is good.* And, (7) *This is the beleefe of our Fathers, we beliene in God the Father Almighty &c. We accurſe the blaſphemy of them who ſay, that God hath commanded any thing impoſsible to man, and that the Commandements of God cannot be kept by euery one, but by all in common.* This very ſaying being vſed by S. Hierome, is therfore reproued by (8) Luther, Caluin, Centuriſtes, Hamelmannus, and Hofman. S. Auſtine alſo pondering thoſe wordes of the Pſalme 108. *Non dominetur mi omnis iniquitas*, hauing alleadged diuers textes of Scripture, he addeth, (9) *By theſe, and other like innumerable teſtimonies I cannot doubt, neither God to haue commanded to man any thing impoſsible, or any thing to be impoſsible for God to worke and help, wherby that which he commandeth may be done; and ſo herby man holpen by God, may be without ſinne if he will.* But S. Auſtine is ſo cleere herin, that Melanchon confeſſeth, and reprehendeth (10) *Imaginationem Auguſtini de impletione legis, Auſtines imagination of fulfilling the law.*

(7) Ser. 182. de Temp.

(8) Tom. 2. Wittemb. fol. 116. Calu. Inſt. l. 2. c. 7. ſect. 5 Cent. 4. c. 10 Col. 1243. Hamel. de Tradit. Apoſt. col. 98. Hof. comment. de pœn fol. 55.

(9) L. 2. de pec. mer. & remiſſ. c. 6.

(10) L. 1. Ep. p. 290.

S. Chryſoſtome affirmeth that, (11) *Not the nature of the Commandements, but the ſlouth of many doth vſe to make difficulty. Therfore if any vndertake them with loue and alacrity of mynd, he ſhall ſee that they are light and eaſie. Wherfore* Chriſt *ſaid,* (12) *My*

(11) Ad pſ. 111.

(12) Mat. 11. 30.

yoake

yoake is sweet and my burden light. The Centuriſts reprove Tertullian ſaying, (13) *No law would be impoſed vpon him, ſaith Tertullian, who had not in his power due obedience to the law: With the ſame Errour he inclyneth euery where to the poſſibility of the law.* Againe, (14) *Origen maintaineth the poſſibilty of the law &c. and ſaith, that the Baptiſed may fulfill the law in all things.* So cleerly do the Fathers expound the Scriptures in proofe of the poſſibility of keeping the Commandements.

(13) Cent. 3. Col. 240.

(14) Ibid. Col. 203.

SECT. IV.

Proteſtants teach, that the Commandements of God are poſsible to be kept.

M. Perkins confeſſeth that, (1) *Whatſoeuer God commandeth in the Ghoſpell, that a man muſt, and can performe &c. The Commandements of the law ſhew vs what we muſt do, but miniſter no power to performe the thing to be done: but the Doctrine and Commandements of the Ghoſpell do otherwiſe, and therefore they are called ſpirit and lyfe; God with the Commandement giuing Grace that the thing preſcribed may be done.*

(1) Ref. Catho. p. 51. 52.

M. Hooker affirmeth that, (2) *Diſtributiuely at the leaſt, all great and grieuous actuall offences, as they offer themſelues one by one, both may, and ought to be auoyded:* wherein he is ſo plaine, that he is therefore reprehended by certayne (3) Puritanes, ſaying, *Heere we demand to be informed, that if all offend in many things &c. how your ſaying can be true, that it is poſsible to auoyd all great and grieuous ſinnes?* Caſtalio ſo cleerely (4) teacheth the ſame doctrine, that he is therefore namely contradicted by D (5) Reynolds.

(2) Eccl. Pol. l. 5 p. 185.

(3) Chriſtian letter to M. Hook p. 15. Willet vpon the 1 Ep. 122. p. 91.

(4) *De perfect obed. leg. Dei.*

(5) 2. Concluſ annex to his Confer. p. 697.

Luther in this agreeth with Catholickes ſaying, (6) *The Commandements of God, euen the lighteſt and leaſt are impoſsible to man by himſelfe; but with the Grace of God they are moſt eaſy: As the Apoſtle (ſayth) I can do all things in him that ſtrengtheneth me. Therefore Hierome ſayd well Let him be accurſed who ſhall ſay the Commandements of God to be impoſsible, but he denyed not, they were impoſsible to vs, to wit, without Gods Grace.*

(6) Defenſ. contra Eckium.

Paræus anoucheth that, *The morall law, ſeeing it is thee ternall Rule of Iuſtice, and ſummarily requireth the loue of God and our Neighbour (which are temporall duties of Man) cannot be ſayd to be abrogated, or euer to be abrogated.* And the ſame is taught by (8) Brentius. Wherefore according to theſe Prot. the Commandements are poſſible to be kept.

(7) Colloq. Theol. 1. Diſp. 8

(8) Hom. in Circumcif. c. 67.

SECT. V.

Obiections from Scriptures in proofe, that it is impoſsible to keepe Gods Commandements, anſwered.

IT is obiected, that Saint Paul ſayth of himſelfe, (1) *To will, is preſent with me, but to accomplish that which is good, I fynd not.* Anſw. The Apoſtle (according to S. (2) Auſtine) ſpeaketh of *Concupiſcence*, which often is felt, though it be not conſented vnto: in which Caſe though it be not ſinne, yet is it troubleſome to a chaſt mynd.

(1) Rom. 7. 18.

(2) Tract. 41. in Ioan. & l. 6. in Iulian c. 11 & l. 2. ad Bonif. c. 10.

Others vrge thoſe wordes of S. Peter, (3) *Why tempt you God, to put a yoake vpon the neckes of the Diſciples, which neyther our fathers nor we haue bene able to beare.* Anſw. The diſcourſe of the whole Chapter plainly ſheweth, this to be ſpoken only of the Ceremoniall law of Moyſes, which yet neyther was ſo importable, as was impoſsible to be kept, for before we heard of ſundry that had kept it, but becauſe it was not kept but with great paine and difficulty.

(3) Act. 15. 10.

Againe it is vrged, that, (4) *In many things we offend all:* whereas whoſoeuer fullfilleth the Law, ſinneth not. Anſw. This is ſpoken of veniall Sinne, which is (5) not ſimply & abſolutely Sinne, but imperfectly: neyther is it altogether agaynſt, but beſides the law: ſo that the fullfilling of the law may ſtand therewith.

(4) Iac. 3. 2. & 1. Io. 1. 8.

(5) S. Tho. 2. 2. q. 88. art. 1.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXXIII.

The true State of the Queſtion, concerning the beſt workes of the Iuſt, being Sinne.

Whether all the workes of the Iuſt, euen the beſt, are in themſelues and of their owne nature truly ſinnes, and deſeruing damnation: or rather that they are truly, and properly iuſt and good.

SECT. I.

Catholike Doctrine.

SEEING no impediment can be greater to the promoting of vertue, or ſpur more ſharpe to incyte men to vice, then for men to perſuade thēſelues that notwithſtanding all care and diligence to the contrary, yet the very beſt actions are ſtayned with Sinne and thoſe mortall: therefore in Confutation of this ſo pernicious Errour the Catholicke Church decreeth that, (1) *If any ſhall ſay that in euery good worke the iuſt doth Sinne at leaſt venially, or which is more intollerable, mortally, and ſo to deſerue eternall punishments; and only therefore not to be damned, becauſe God doth not impute thoſe workes to damnation, Anathema.* (1) Concil. Trid Seſſ. 6. Can. 25.

In the Councell Senonenſe it is expreſly defyned, that, (2) *All workes are not ſinne.* And this Article is there condemned. (3) *The iuſt man ſinneth in euery good worke: Euery good worke euen the beſt is veniall.*

(2) *Decret. 16.*
(3) *In Anathemat. poſt Decreta ſibi.*

Anſwerably herunto all (4) Catholickes believe, that the workes of the Iuſt, by the help of Gods Grace, are not only not ſinne, either mortall or veniall, but truly iuſt, vertuous, and pleaſing to God.

(4) *Bellar. de Iuſtif. l. 4. c. 15.*

Points Diſputable.

Some (5) Schoolmen teach that euery worke we do in particular, is either good or euill. Others thinke that there are ſome indifferent, neither good nor euill.

(5) *See Suarez tom. 1. 2. Diſp. 29. ſect. 2. n. 3.*

Proteſtant Doctrine.

Proteſtants teach that, (*) *No worke can come from the iuſt which doth not deſerue iuſt reward of reproach.* And, (6) *Good workes if they be cenſured with exact rigour, are rather worthy of eternall Damnation, then the reward of life.* (7) *No other thing can we chooſe, deſire, or do, but euill.* Whitaker, *Inherent* (8) *Concupiſcence cauſeth, that we ſinne in euery action of ours, euen good. And we teach, that the Iuſt, according to the nature of the thing, and their actions, do alwaies ſinne mortally.* A teartull and deſperate opinion.

(*) *Calu. Inſtit. l. 3. c. 14. §. 9. & l. 3. c. 22. §. 4.*
(6) *In Auſtido to Concilij Seſſ. 6. c. 11.*
(7) *Calu. Inſtruct. cont. Libertinos. c. 14.*
(8) *De pec. orig. l. 2. c. 3. p. 658.*

Proteſtant Errours.

Luther (9) wrote a whole Booke entituled, *Quòd iuſtus etiam inter bene operandum, peccet: That the iuſt man ſinneth euen when he doth well,* that is, as he through the whole Booke expoundeth himſelfe, *in all his actions.* In ſo much, that to vſe Luthers owne words, (10) *all things that he doth are the workes of the Deuill, the workes of ſinne the workes of darkenes, the workes of folly.* And, (11) *We conſtantly affirme, the Iuſt man to ſinne by praying.*

(9) *Extat Tom. 2. oper. Lutheri. fol. 196. Edit. Witeemb. 1558.*
(10) *Argumento 10. ex 24.*
(11) *Serm. de Aſcenſione Domini.*

Beza proceedeth ſo far, that he affirmeth vertues to be ſinnes

ſinnes his words are. (12) *Queſtion. But Philoſophicall vertues certes are not ſinnes. Anſwere Yes ſinnes, If ſinne be ἀσοφία, that is, whatſoeuer declineth but the leaſt from the Law of God.* But good God, what times are theſe, wherein vertues are called ſinnes? What would Ariſtotle ſay if he were now liuing, if he ſhould heare men profeſſing learning and vertue, to auouch, that it is ſinne to do prudently in our actions: that it is ſinne to be temperate and ſober, in eating and drinking: that it is ſinne to be valiant and couragious in daungers and aduerſities: that it is ſinne to be liberall and bountifull in giuing our goods dulce: laſtly that it is ſinne to giue euery man his owne, and to imbrace Iuſtice. But what ſhall I ſay againſt theſe, but that which is thundred vpon their head by the Prophet Iſay. (13) *Woe vnto you that call euill good, and good euill, putting darkenes light and light darkenes, putting bitter for ſweet, and ſweet for bitter &c. Wo to you that are mighty to drinke wyne & ſtout men in drunkeneſs, which iuſtify the impious for guiftes, and take away the Iuſtice of the Iuſt from them:* Which certainly none would do, but mad-men or drunkards.

(12) *Tom. 2. oper. p. 603. q. 93.*

(13) *C. 5. 20. 22. 23.*

SECT. II.

It is proued by Scriptures, that all the workes of the Iuſt are not Sinne, nor deſeruing Damnation.

THe Scriptures expreſſely teach, that ſome workes of the Iuſt are not ſinne. (1) *In all theſe things Iob ſinned not with his lippes.* And that he ſinned not in hart it is further ſayd. (2) *Haſt thou conſidered my ſeruant Iob, that there is not the like to him in the Earth, a man ſimple and right, and fearing God, and departing from euill, and yet retayning Innocency?* In lyke ſort King Dauid ſayth of himſelfe. (3) *Iudge me O Lord according to my Iuſtice, & according to my Innocency vpon me.* (4) *By fyre thou haſt examined me, and there is no Iniquity found in me.* (5) *Our Lord will reward me accordyng to my Iuſtice and according to the Purity of my hands he will reward me. Becauſe I haue kept the wayes of our Lord; neither haue I done impiouſly from my God.* In theſe places he auoucheth his workes to be Iuſtices, Innocency, Purity, and without Iniqui-

(1) *Iob. c. 1. 22.*
(2) *C. 2. 3.*
(3) *Pſ. 7 9.*
(4) *Pſ. 16. 3.*
(5) *Pſ. 17. 21. & 23. 101.*

Iniquity: Yea he confidētly hoped that they might ſtand in the Iudgment of God; otherwiſe deſiring to be iudged according to his Iuſtice, inſteed of pardon, he ſhould aske Damnation.

The Scriptures diſtinguiſh betwene good and euill deeds, (6) *If you fulfill the Royall law according to the Scriptures, (Thou ſhalt loue thy Neighbour as thy ſelfe) you do well: but if you accept perſons you worke ſinne &c.* And, *whoſoeuer ſhall keep the whole law, but offend in one, is made guilty of all.* So alſo S. Peter. (7) *Labour the more, that by good workes you may make ſure your Vocation and Election. For doing theſe things you ſhall not ſinne at any tyme.* Theſe textes proue a diſtinction of good and euill workes, ſo that all are not ſinne.

(6) Iac. 2. 8.
(6) 2. Pet. 1. 10.

According to Caluin, (8) *Nothing is acceptable to God, but what in euery part is entyre and abſolute, and defyled with no impurity:* and yet Scriptures teach that, (9) *He that feareth (God) and worketh Iuſtice is acceptable to him.* (10) *I was filled after I receiued of Ephaphrodites the things that you ſent, an odour of ſweetnes, an acceptable hoaſt pleaſing to God.* (11) *To offer ſpirituall hoaſts acceptable to God.* Now to ſay that good workes are not acceptable, but only Chriſts imputation, is indeed to affirme, that deadly and enormous Crimes are acceptable and pleaſing to God by his imputation, which is moſt abſurd.

(8) In Ff. l. 3. c. 12. §. 1.
(9) Act. 10. 36.
(10) Philip. 4. 18.
(11) 1. Pet. 2. 5. See 1. Io. 3. 22.
(12) Io. 5. 14.
(13) 1. Cor. 15. 34.

Againe, if in all our beſt actions we cannot but ſinne, to what end are we ſo much dehorted from Sinne, (12) *Sinne no more.* (13) *Awake ye Iuſt, and ſinne not.* (14) *Be angry, and do not ſinne.* And ſee the like in (15) other places.

(14) Pſ. 4. 5.
(15) 2. Pet. 2. 10. 1. Io. 2. 1.

But the workes of the iuſt are expreſly ſaid to be good, (16) *Let your light ſhyne before men, that they may ſee your good workes:* (17) *Command the rich of this world &c. to do well, to become rich in good workes.* (18) *They which believe in God be careſull to excell in good workes.* Now ſeeing that (according to S. (19) Dionyſius) is ſaid to be euill, which in any thing is wanting, and that only to be good, which is entirely and abſolutly good, therfore ſeeing the holy Ghoſt calleth the workes of the iuſt, good, they are truly and abſolutly good, and conſequently not ſinne.

(16) Mat. 5. 17.
(17) 1. Tim. 6. 17. 18.
(18) Tit. 3. 8.
(19) De diuin. Nom. c. 4.

If all our beſt actions be Sinnes, then all theſe abſurdi-

ties

ties follow. 1. That the workes of fayth, whereby a man is iuſtifyed, and Charity, were ſinne, and ſo we iuſtifyed by Sinne. 2. When we ſay, *forgiue vs our Sinnes*, by Sinne we ſeeke to obtayne remiſſion of Sinne. 3. For ſinnes we ſhould expect a (20) *Crowne of Iuſtice*. 4. When we are commanded to pray, faſt, giue Almes, preach, read the Scriptures, we are commanded to Sinne. 5. Seeing (21) *God it is who worketh in vs all good deeds*, God ſinneth. 6. Then Chriſt did not (22) *redeeme vs from all iniquity, and cleanſe to himſelfe a people acceptable, a purſuer of good workes*. 7. All good workes are to be done, but according to Proteſtants, ſome mortall Sinnes are good workes: Ergo ſome mortall Sinnes are to be done. Agayne no mortall Sinne is to be done, but al good workes are mortall Sinnes, Ergo no good worke it to be done.

(20) 2. Tim. 4.8.
(21) Philip. 2.13.
(22) Tit. 2.14.

Laſtly, ſeeing it is ſayd (23) *For the iuſt man ſhall fall 7. tymes a day, and ſhall ryſe agayne*: I would demand whether the iuſt man ſinneth by riſing agayne, or no? If they affirm, then muſt they needs ſay, that to riſe is the ſame that to fall, & to fall the ſame that to riſe; and ſo conſequently a man is as much behoulding to him that caſteth him into a pit, as to him that draweth him out: & on the contrary, as much iniured by him that draweth him out, as by him that caſt him in: and ſo for a full contradiction, that both theſe actions are iniurious and beneficiall. If they deny the forſayd ryſing to be ſinne, then we haue our Intent, that all the actions of the iuſt are not Sinne.

(23) Prou. 24.16.

SECT III.

That the Ancient Fathers do expound the Scriptures in proofe that the workes of the iuſt are truly good, and not ſinne.

SAint Gregory vpon the former words concerning Iob writeth, *If we ſay that Iob ſinned in his words, which were* (1) L. 2. Mor. c. 8.

wickednes to thinke, we say that God lost the victory; in that which he proposed. S. Austine expounding those words of Iob, man cannot be iustifyed compared with God, writeth, (1) It seemeth to me not an vnfit speach, in comparison of Gods Iustice, if the holy Angels in heauen be not sayd to be iust, not that they should be thus, are they fallen from iustice, but because they are made, and are not God, neither can they haue so much spirituall light, as he hath by whome they are made: for there is greatest Iustice, where greatest wisedome, & this is God &c. By participation of whome they are iust, in comparison of him they are not iust.

(1) Lib. ad Orosium cont. Priscillian. & Origenistas, c. 10.

SECT. IV.

That Protestant writers do teach, that the workes of the Iust are truly good, and not Sinne.

ALl such Protestantes as I haue (1) formerly produced, teaching that Man hath freewill with Gods Grace to do good, and eschew euill: and that with the same Grace it is possible to keep Gods Commandementes, and so not sinne; As also such others as I shall (2) afterwards alledge, in proofe that man is iustifyed by faith and good workes: and that the said good workes do merit Grace and Glory; all these I say do, and must needs believe, that iust men may do workes truly good, and not sinfull. For to say, that a man by sinfull and wicked workes doth keepe Gods Commandementes, is iustified, and doth merit Grace and Glory, is most absurd and impious.

(1) See before Chap. 31. 32.

(2) See hereafter Chap. 36.

SECT.

SECT. V.

Obiections from Scripture in proofe, that the workes of the iuſt are truly Sinne, anſwered.

SOme obiect theſe words of K. Dauid, (1) *Enter not into Iudgment with thy ſeruant, becauſe no man liuing ſhalbe iuſtifyed in thy ſight.* Anſw. S. Auſtine writing vpon this place affirmeth, that no man can be iuſtifyed in Gods ſight, becauſe he hath no Iuſtice of himſelfe, but that which he hath, he hath from God. 2. S. Hierome, (2) S. Auſtine, and S. Gregory do likewiſe expound this of veniall ſinnes, wherof none can iuſtify himſelfe in this world. 3. According to S. Hilary, (3) S. Hierome, and others, None can be ſaid to be iuſtifyed in the Preſence of God, not that there is not true Iuſtice in holy men, but that the purity and worth of the Iuſtice of God is ſuch, that all the Iuſtice of Angels and Men compared therwith ſeemeth Iniuſtice: Euen as the ſtars in themſelues moſt cleere, waxe yet darke in the preſence of the Sunne. In which ſenſe Iob ſaid. (4) *Indeed I know it is ſo, and that man can-not be iuſtifyed compared with God*; wherof ſee S. Auſtine here in the third Section.

(1) Pſ.142.2.

(2) *Aug. l. de Perfect. iuſtitiæ. Greg. in hunc locum. Hieron. Ep. ad Ciſphontem.*

(3) *Hil. Iunr. Arnob. Euthym. in hunc locum. Bern. Ser. 3. de verbis Iſaiæ.*

(4) C 9.2.

Others obiect that, (5) *All we are become as one vncleane, and all our Iuſtices as the cloath of a menſtrued woman.* Anſw. The word, *all*, in Scripture is often (6) vſed only for many. 2. Iſay ſpeaketh not here of the iuſt, but of notorious (7) ſinners, for whoſe crymes, the Citty and all the people were to be deliuered into the hands of the K. (8) of Babylon. 3. Though he had ſpoken of all the people, yet ſpake he not of all tymes, and therfore though as then they were wicked when they were giuen as Captines, yet both before (9) and after, they might be iuſt. 4 And though he had ſpoken of all tymes, yet ſpake he not of all their workes, but only of thoſe which they thought to be their chiefeſt Iuſtifications, as their *Sacrifices, Feaſts, New-Moones &c* which becauſe they performed not with pure intention, and in ſuch ſort as they

(5) Iſa. 64. 6.

(6) Gen. 9. 12. 1. Cor 1. 3. 7 8. & 2. Cor. 12.

(7) Iſa. 64. 5 7

(8) See Iſa. 8. 5. 7.

(9) Ver. 11.

ought, they were compared to foule Cloathes, and were hatefull to God; and accordingly it was said, (10) *Offer Sacrifice no more in vaine: Incense is abhomination to me. The New-Moone, and the Sabboth, and other feild misses, I will not abyde &c.*

(10) *Isa.1.13.*

(11) *Eccl.7. 21. Rom.3.10.*

Some obiect (11) *That there is not a iuſt man vpon Earth, who doth good, and not ſinne.* Anſw. Theſe words only import, that there is none ſo iuſt, that he alwaies doth that which is good, but that all men do ſometimes ſinne, either mortally or venially, which we do not deny. And ſo it is ſaid of (12) Iob, Zachary, Elizabeth, and ſuch like, *that they were iuſt before God*, and yet no man denieth, but that they ſinned ſometimes, at leaſt venially.

(12) *Iob. 1.1. & Luc. 1.6.*

CHAP.

CHAP. XXXIV.

The True State of the Queſtion, concerning the Infallible knowledge of our Predeſtination and Saluation.

Whether Man in this World, without ſpeciall Reuelation from God, can haue infallible knowledge of his preſent Iuſtification, Predeſtination, and Eternall Saluation: In ſo much that euery one is bound as firmly to beleiue his owne Saluation, as he doth the Articles of his Creed: Or only that in this World a morall certainty can be had therof. And whether true faith, and Iuſtice once had, may be loſt.

SECT. I.

Catholike Doctrine.

THIS deſperate Preſumption of being Predeſtinate, doth ſo dangerouſly draw men to the perpetration of all vice: as that in preuention thereof, the Catholicke Church hath decreed, that, (1) *It is not to be affirmed, that thoſe who are truly iuſtifyed, ought to determine with themſelues without all doubtfulnes, that they are Iuſtifyed, and that no man is abſolued from ſinne, and Iuſtifyed, but he who certainly beleueth himſelfe to be Abſoluted*

(1) *Concil. Trid Seſſ. 6. Cap. 9.*

ſolued and Iuſtifyed. and by this only faith, Abſolution and Iuſtification to be perfected: as if he that doth not beliene this, should doubt of the Promiſes of God, and of the Efficacy of the Death and Reſurrection of Chriſt; for as no Godly man ought to doubt of the mercy of God, of the merit of Chriſt. and of the vertue and Efficacy of the Sacramentes: ſo euery one whileſt he beholdeth himſelfe, and his owne infirmitie, and indiſpoſition, may doubt and feare of his owne Grace, ſeeing no man can know with certainty of fayth, which is not ſubiect to falshood, that he hath obtained the Grace of God. It likewiſe teacheth that,

(2) Seſſ. 6. cap. 12. (2) No man in this lyfe ought ſo much to preſume of the ſecret Myſtery of Gods Predeſtination, as that he should certainly determine himſelfe to be in the number of the Predeſtinate: as though it were true, that a man iuſtifyed either can ſinne no more, or if he ſinne, that he ought to promiſe to himſelfe aſſured repentance: for without ſpeciall Reuelation it cannot be knowne whom God hath choſen. And againe, (3) If any man ſhall ſay, that for the obtayning pardon of ſinnes, it is neceſſary for euery man that he certainly beliene, and without any doubt of his owne Infirmitie and Indiſpoſition, that his ſinnes are forgiuen him, Anathema.

(3) Seſſ. 6. Can. 13.

(4) Bellar. de Iuſtif. l. 2. c. 3. Rhem Teſt. in Rom. 8. 28. Agreably heerunto all (4) Catholickes do beliene, that without ſpeciall Reuelation from God, no man in this life can be aſſured with certainty of diuine fayth, that his ſinnes are forgiuen him, that he is truly iuſtifyed, one of the Predeſtinate, and certainly to be ſaued.

(5) Vega. in Concil. Trid. l. 9. c. 40. (6) Barth. Medina. 1. 2. q. 112. art. 3. Concl. 5. (7) See Them. apud Magiſtrum. in 3. Diſt. 23. (8) Tapperus To. 2. art. 8. p. 64. and others.

Points Diſputable.

Although all agree that none can be certaine of preſent Grace and future Saluation, with ſuch certainty of fayth as is not ſubiect to falſhood; yet (5) ſome thinke, that ſome ſpirituall men haue ſuch humane certitude therof, as is altogether voyd of all doubt and feare. (6) Others teach, that the Iuſt man hath not ſuch morall certainty of Grace, excluding all heſitation or doubt. Some (7) teach, that it is not the ſame *numero*, or indiuiduall fayth, ioyned with Charity and without it. But (8) others, more truly, teach the contrary.

Proue-

Proteſtant Vntruthes.

Caluin (9) affirmeth, that the Fathers of the Councell of Trent do confound Doubt with Faith: But Chemnitius latheth further auouching, (10) that they make *Doubt* the vertue and ornament of *fayth*, in ſuch ſort, that *Fayth* without *Doubt* ſhould not be true & iuſtifying. Yea hemaketh the queſtion between vs & Proteſtãts, to be, whether Iuſtifying fayth be *fiducia, an dubitatio de remiſſione peccatorum, truſt or doubt of remiſsion of ſinnes.* But all this is ſo vntrue, that therefore rather the Councell reiecteth the ſpeciall fayth of Heretickes, & affirmeth it to be, not *Fayth*, but vayne confidence, ſeeing, that *Fayth* cannot be certaine, wheras true *Fayth* muſt be moſt certayne.

(9) *In Antidoto Concil.*
(10) *Exam. ad Seſſ. 6.*
(11) *In Confeſſ. Auguſt. art. 6 & 20. Melanct. loc. com. de Iuſtific. Calu. Inſtit. l. 3. c. 2. Chem. Exam. cap 9. Seſſ. 6. Whitak. cont. Dur. l. 8. p. 635. 637. Perkins Reform. Cath. p. 38. 54. Willet. Synop. p. 582.*
(12) *Concione vlt.*
(13) *Def. of. Apol. part. 2. c. 6 ſect. 3. Perkins To. 2. of Bap. Col. 810. Som. ibid. Col. 206.*
(14) *Apud Zanch. Tom. 7 de Perſeuer. c. vlt.*
(15) *L. de defertione. col. 1020.*
(16) *Epit. Colloq. Monſp. p. 44. 48.*

Proteſtant Doctrine.

Prot. (11) teach, that all belieuers ought no leſſe certainly and infallibly to belieue, that they are already receyued into Grace, then that God is one in Eſſence, & three in Perſon, or any other Article of Fayth to be true. And they thinke, this aſſent principally to be that aſſent of Chriſtian fayth, which is required in Scriptures for Iuſtification, and without which, the beliefe of other Articles, is Hiſtoricall, and Diabolicall.

Whitaker, (12) *This one thing I ſay, thoſe who deny that we are certayne of ſaluation with certainty of fayth, do leaue vs no fayth.* Iewell affirmeth that men of his ſort, (13) *Are as certayne of the forgiuenes of their ſinnes in the Blood of Chriſt, as if Chriſt were preſent, and ſhould tell it vnto them.* Bucer, (14) *There is nothing more profitable then to preach, that it is impoſsible for the faythfull that they euer fall from Grace.* Perkins, (15) *This Axiome is to be bouldē: He that is once in the ſtate of Grace is alwayes to perſeuer in it.* And others teach, that (16) *he that doth once truly belieue, cannot afterward fall from the Grace of God, or looſe his fayth by Adultery, or any other lyke ſinnes.* A comfortable Doctrine for Adulterers murderers, drunkards, and the lyke.

Prote-

Proteſtantes agree with Ancient Heretickes.

S. Irenæus (17) reproueth the *Gnoſtickes*, for that they deemed themſelues ſo perfect & iuſt, that they thought they could not be defyled with Sinne.

(17) L.2.c.1.

Proteſtant Errours.

Chriſt our Sauiour (according to Luther) (18) *ſuffered the feare and horrour of a Conſcience troubled, and taſting wrath eternall &c. but what abſurdity to attribute to Chriſt a Conſcience feering for a ſmall tyme?* Yea (19) *Chriſt at the ſame tyme to be exceeding ioyfull, and exceedingly deſpayring.* According to Melanchthon, (20) *The third, and that the cheefeſt cauſe of Chriſtes feare, was a certaine feeling of Gods forſaking and anger, whereby Chriſt was vncertaine betweene Hell and lyfe.* Yea ſayth Caluin, (21) *A horrible depth of deſtruction with feare & anxiety did grieuouſly vex him.* The like in ſundry places teacheth Beza (22) and concludeth, that *in this deiection of Chriſt the ſumme of our comfort conſiſteth.* Laſtly, Serranus blaſphemeth that, (23) *he ſtrugled with the horrour of eternall death, and extremely feared the waight of eternall punishments.* Heere Prot. make Chriſt our Sauiour to be fearefull and doubtfull of his owne Saluation: and yet euery one of them is aſſured by fayth of their owne.

(18) Tom 3. in Pſ. 22. fol. 330.
(19) Ib. fol. 310.
(20) In Mat. 26.
(21) In Mat. 26.37.
(22) In Heb. 5.7. & in Luc. 22.44.
(23) Cont. Hayum. part. 2. p. 280.
(24) In Mat. 27.24.
(25) Inſtit. l. 3. c. 2 §. 18.
(26) L. Quæſt. p 672.
(27) In loc. Cloſſ. 2. c. 13. §. 2.
(28) De Iuſtif. l. 4. c. 27. p. 1219.
(29) Tom. 2. in c. 5. Gal.
(30) De Iuſt. Controu. 3. § p. 88.
(31) Poſtil. in die Natiu. fol. 51.
(32) Inſtit. l. 4. c. 17. §. 2.

Caluin, (24) *Seeing perfect fayth is no more extant, it followeth in part that men are incredulous.* And, (25) *Certainty is mingled with doubt.* Beza, (26) *In one and the ſame ſubiect yet in diuers reſpects, there are impurity and vncleanes, light and darknes, fayth and incredulity.* Peter Martyr, (27) *It is not abſurd, One and the ſame worke to be good and wicked.* Paræus, (28) *I anſwere. It is no abſurdity, Fayth to haue diffidence or incredulity mingled with it, which is ſinne, and ſo by accident Fayth to be ſin.* Perkins, (29) *True faith is alwaies mingled with contrary incredulity, in ſo much that thoſe who beliue, may feele in themſelues much incredulity.* Yea ſayth Scarpius (30) *With fayth may ſtand an Act of incredulity, but not with full force.* Luther, (31) *He muſt firſt be damned, before he can be damned for whome he gaue himſelfe.* Caluin, (32) *We dare promiſe ſal-*

ſecurely to our ſelues lyfe eternall to be ours, neyther can the Kingdom of heauen more fall away from vs, then from him (to wit) *Chriſt.* Tindall, (33) *Thou canſt not be damned vnles Chriſt be damned, nor Chriſt ſaued vnles thou be ſaued.* Perkins, (34) *I thinke my ſelfe as certayne of Salvation, as if my Name were expreſly written in the ſacred Scriptures.* Zanchius, (35) *Euery one is bound by the Commandement of God, to beleiue, that he is elected, and predeſtinated in Chriſt, to eternall Saluation. When we ſay euery man to be bound to beleiue, we except no man, not the reprobate, who neyther will beleiue, nor can beleiue in Chriſt.* Who would imagine, that any man profeſſing Chriſtianity, would belch out ſuch blaſpemies and abſurd impieties? And yet they are the Doctrines of Luther, Caluin, Beza, Zanchius, Tindall and Perkins; men renowned amongſt Prot. but deſeruedly infamous and hatefull to all others.

(33) *Act. Mon. p. 1137.*
(34) *Conſtit. of Satan. Tom. 1. Col. 1305.*
(35) *Tom. 2. l. 1. de Nat. Dei. c. 2.*

SECT. II.

It is proued by Scripture, that man in this world without ſpeciall Reuelation from God, cannot haue infallible knowledge of his preſent Iuſtification, Predeſtination, and eternall Saluation: And that true fayth and Iuſtice once had, may be loſt.

TO examine this by the ſacred Scriptures, they expreſly teach our Ignorance or vncertaine knowledge of our Predeſtination or Saluation. (1) *Who* (ſaith Salomon) *can ſay, My hart is cleane, I am pure from ſinne?* And yet it is certaine, that ſome are cleane, according to that of S. Paul, (2) *But you are waſhed, but you are ſanctifyed, but you are iuſtifyed &c.* Againe, (3) *There are iuſt men and wyſe, and their workes are in the hand of God: and yet man knoweth not whether he be worthy of loue or hatred: but all things are reſerued vncertaine for the tyme to come &c.* In like ſort prayeth K. Dauid, (4) *Sinnes who vnderſtandeth? from my ſecret ſinnes clenſe me.* And S. Paul affirmeth of himſelfe thus, (5) *To me it is a thing of leaſt account to be iudged of you, or of mans day: but I iudge not my ſelfe neither, for I am not guilty in*

(1) *Prou. 20.*
(2) *1. Cor. 6.*
(3) *Eccl. 9. 1.*
(4) *Pſ. 18. 13.*
(5) *1. Cor. 4. 3. 4. 5.*

Conſcience of any thing, but I am not iuſtifyed heerin, but he that iudgeth me is our Lord: therfore iudge not before the tyme vntill our Lord do come, who alſo will lighten the hidden things of darknes, and will manifeſt the Counſailes of the harts &c. Theſe textes expreſſly teach, that no man can giue an infallible iudgment of his preſent Iuſtification, or Saluation.

Such places alſo as require certaine Conditions of our part for our Iuſtification, proue the like vncertainty of knowledge: So Moyſes ſaith to the Iſraelites, (6) *When thou ſhalt ſeeke there the Lord thy God, thou ſhalt fynd him, yet ſo if thou ſeeke him with all thy hart.* In like ſort Ezechiel, (7) *If the impious ſhall do Pennance from all ſinnes &c. And ſhall keep all my preceptes &c. liuing, he ſhall liue, and not dye &c. But if the iuſt man ſhall turne away himſelfe from his iuſtice, and do iniquitie &c. ſhall he liue? All his iuſtices which he had done, ſhall not be remembred &c.* Yea Chriſt himſelfe ſayth, (8) *If you keep my Preceptes you ſhall abyde in my loue.* And, (9) *You are my friends, if you do the things that I command you.* But, (10) *If any abyde not in me, he ſhalbe caſt forth as the branch, and ſhall withar &c.* Now no man knoweth with certainty of faith, that he performeth theſe Conditions, ſeeing no Scripture teſtifieth the ſame of any man in particular. As alſo theſe places conuince, that he that is once iuſtifyed, or in ſtate of Grace, may afterwards fall, and looſe the ſame.

(6) *Deut.* 4. 29. *Iſa.* 19. 10.

(7) *Ez.* 18. 21.

(8) *Io.* 15. 10.

(9) *Io* 15. 14.

(10) *Io.* 15. 6.

But ſome reply, that theſe workes are not required as a Condition vpon which the promiſe of eternall life dependeth, but becauſe true faith cannot be without good workes. But firſt the words of the text are cleere conditionall. 2. We do not here inquire why workes are neceſſary, but are content that it be granted that they are neceſſary, and that without them eternall Saluation cannot be gained. For hence we conclude euidently, that without diuine Reuelation no man can certainly decree himſelfe to be of the number of the Elect, ſeeing no man (as Prot. will confeſſe) can aſſure himſelfe that he doth all thoſe good workes which Chriſt commanded to be done: yea a litle before they cleerly taught, that in our beſt actions we breake Gods Commandements, and ſinne.

Other places alſo ſhew, that it is vncertaine whether we obtayne

obtaine remiſſion of our ſinne: ſo Ioel ſaith of God, (11) *who knoweth if he will conuert and forgiue &c.* And S. Peter ſaid to Simon Magus, (12) *Do pennance therfore from this thy wickednes, & pray to God, if perhaps this Cogitation of thy hart may be remitted thee.* Though theſe and the like places do not proue any vncertainty in Gods promiſes to ſuch as truly repent, yet they proue the vncertainty of remiſſion of our ſinnes, in regard of the vncertainty of our Diſpoſition requiſite to the ſame.

(11) C. 2. 14.
(12) Act. 8. 22.

The ſame truth alſo is confirmed by ſuch textes as exhort vs to worke our Saluation with *Feare.* (13) *With feare and trembling worke your Saluation.* (14) *In feare conuerſe yee the tyme of your ſeiourning.* (15) *But thou by faith doſt ſtand; be not too highly wyſe, but feare: for if God hath not ſpared the naturall boughes, leſt perhaps he will not ſpare thee neither.* And therfore, (16) *he that thinketh himſelfe to ſtand, let him take heed leſt he fall:* Yea, (17) *Let vs feare therfore leſt perhaps forſaking the Promiſe of entring into his reſt, ſome of you be thought to be wanting.* Yea S. Paul himſelfe was not aſſured, but carefull, (18) *If by any meanes I may come* (ſaith he) *to the Reſurrection which is from the dead.* And, (19) *I chaſtice my body, and bring it into ſeruitude, leſt perhaps when I haue preached to others, my ſelfe become reprobate.*

(13) Philip. 2. 12. Pſ. 2. 11.
(14) 1. Pet. 1. 17.
(15) Rom. 11. 20. 21.
(16) 1. Cor. 10. 12.
(17) Heb 4. 1.
(18) Philip. 3. 11.
(19) 1. Cor. 9. 27.

Caluin and Chemnitius anſwere, that theſe wordes are vttered by the holy Ghoſt, not that there is any danger, that the faythfull ſhall fall from ſaluation, but only to ſhake of the ſlouth and carnall ſecurity of men negligent in doing good workes. But though it be true, that thoſe who are predeſtinate ſhall not fall from Saluation, and that the holy Ghoſt doth ſpeake theſe wordes to ſtirre vp the Elect to care and diligence, yet they cannot be vnderſtood of thoſe who certainly know and belieue their Predeſtination, but of ſuch as are ignorant thereof: for theſe who are ſo certaine cannot feare the loſſe of Saluation, yea they ought not to feare it, if they as certainly belieue it, as they belieue Chriſt to be God: and therefore the holy Ghoſt ſhould exhort them to Infidelity, when he exhorteth them to feare the loſſe of their Saluation: euen as he ſhould do the lyke, who ſhould exhort a Chriſtian to feare whether Chriſt were God. Wherefore ſeeing by theſe places we are com-

manded to feare, we neither ought nor can firmly beleiue, that we are certainly of the number of the Predeſtinate, and of thoſe that infallibly are to be ſaued.

And Reaſon conuinceth this truth: for nothing can be certaine with certainty of faith, but what is either immediatly contained in the word of God, or by euident conſequence deduced from thence; but this particular propoſition, *Luther is predeſtinate*, is neither of the former waies proued from the Scripture: for that which in this point can be deduced from thence is, that ſuch as beliene, and repent, and ſo continue, ſhall certainly be ſaued, and ſo are predeſtinate. Now that Luther did thus, is no waies deduced certainly from Scripture: But that he did to the contrary, many ſtrong prooſes might be produced.

The forſaid vncertainty of our Saluation is further proued, by all ſuch textes as conuince, that true faith and Iuſtice once had, may afterwards be loſt. Moyſes ſaith to God, (20) *Either forgiue them this treſpas, or if thou do not, ſtrike me out of the Booke that thou haſt written. To whom our Lord anſwered: he that hath ſinned to me, him will I ſtrike out of my booke.* According to which ſaith K. Dauid, (21) *Let them be put out of the booke of the liuing, and with the iuſt let them not be written.* Chriſt ſaith, (22) *For they vpon the rocke, ſuch as when they heare with ioy receyue the word: and theſe haue no rootes, becauſe for a tyme they beliene, and in tyme of tentation they reuolte.* So likewiſe S. Paul, (23) *Becauſe of Incredulity the boughes were broken, but thou by faith doſt ſtand &c. ſee then the goodnes and ſeuerity of God: vpon them ſuch that are fallen, the ſeuerity: but vpon thee the goodnes of God, if thou abyde in his goodnes, otherwiſe alſo thou ſhalt be cut off. But they alſo, if they do not abyde in Incredulity, ſhalbe grafted in. for God is able to graffe them in againe.* (24) *Having faith and a good Conſcience, which certaine repelling haue made ſhipwracke about the faith.* (25) *In the laſt tymes certaine ſhall depart from the faith.* (26) *It is impoſſible* (or rare, and difficult) *for them that were once illuminated, haue taſted alſo the heauenly guifte, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghoſt &c. and are fallen, to be renewed againe to Pennance.* And the like might be ſhewed out of (27) ſundry other places of holy writt. But wheras theſe Scriptures affirme of ſome,

(20) Exod. 32. 32.
(21) Pſ. 68. 29.
(22) Luc. 8. 13.
(23) Rom. 11. 20. 21. 23.
(24) 1. Tim. 1. 19.
(25) 1. Tim. 4. 1. & 1. Tim. 6. 10.
(26) Heb. 6. 4. 5. 6.
(27) Io 15. 2. 6. 1 Cor. 9 27. Gal. 5 4. 2. Pet. 2. 21. 22.

ſome. (28) that, *for a tyme they believe*, that, (29) *They have made shipwracke about faith*, that (30) *They will depart from faith*, and ſundry ſuch like; Scharpius anſwereth (31) to all theſe, that they are not to be vnderſtood *of true faith*, but only of counterfaite and dead faith. But this Expoſition is directly contrary to the expreſſe words & ſenſe of the textes, as euery one may obſerue by the bare reading of them.

(28) *Luc.8.13.*
(29) *1. Tim. 1.19.*
(30) *1. Tim. 4.1.*
(31) *De Iuſtif.controu. 5.6.7.*

Sundry examples do alſo confirme this: for firſt the damned Angels before their fall, were iuſt, as the Fathers gather from the 14. Chapter of Eſay, and the 28. of Ezechiel. Prot. grant our firſt Parents to haue bene indued with faith and grace, and yet their grieuous fall we all yet feele. The like might be exemplified in (32) Saul, in (33) Dauid, in (34) Salomon, in (35) Peter, in (36) Simon Magus, and Iudas (37) the traytour. The Examples of Adam, Dauid and Peter, proue that true Iuſtice may be loſt, and recouered; the other of Saran and Iudas conuince that ſuch as are truly iuſt, do ſometimes fall from the ſame, & become reprobate.

(32) *1. Reg. 9. 2. & 15. 26. 35. Aug. l. 2. ad Simpl. q. 2. Cypr. l. 2. ep. 5.*
(33) *1. Reg. 11. 4. 15. Act. 13. 22.*
(34) *1. Reg. 7. 14. & 11. 14.*
(35) *Cyp. l. 1. ep. 5. Aug. l. 22. cont. Fauſt. c. 88.*
(36) *Mat. 16. 17. Io 13. 10. & Mat. 26. 74.*
(37) *Act. 8. 21. 22. 23.*

This point is yet made more euident from the Doctrine of Proteſtantes, for wheras they teach that, (38) *Iuſtifying faith cannot be without Charity, no more then fyre can be without heate*, it hence followeth, that if a man may looſe his Charity, he doth alſo therewithall looſe his faith, and ſo by conſequence looſe the certaine knowledge of his owne Saluation, Now that a man may looſe his Charity, beſides that it was ſaid to the Church of Epheſus, (39) *Thou haſt left thy firſt Charity*, it may be proued by Dauid, the choſen ſeruant of God, who loſt the ſame, when he, as Bruce confeſſeth, *ſlept* (40) *in ſinne of Adultery* (41) *and murther*: for voluntary intended murder, is a Priuation of Charity: to which end S. Iohn ſaith, (42) *Euery one that is not iuſt is not of God and he that loueth not his brother.* (43) *He that loueth not abydeth in death*: therfore Dauid in his murther of Vrias, and before his repentance was not of God, but for the tyme abode in death, & ſo had neither Charity, nor (according to Prot.) Faith.

(38) *Iuſtifying faith cannot be without Charity, no more then fyre can be without heate*, it hence followeth, that if a man may looſe his Charity, he doth alſo therewithall looſe his faith, and ſo by conſequence looſe the certaine knowledge of his owne Saluation, Now that a man may looſe his Charity, beſides that it was ſaid to the Church of Epheſus, (39) *Thou haſt left thy firſt Charity*, it may be proued by Dauid, the choſen ſeruant of God, who loſt the ſame, when he, as Bruce confeſſeth, *ſlept* (40) *in ſinne of Adultery* (41) *and murther*: for voluntary intended murder, is a Priuation of Charity: to which end S. Iohn ſaith, (42) *Euery one that is not iuſt is not of God and he that loueth not his brother.* (43) *He that loueth not abydeth in death*: therfore Dauid in his murther of Vrias, and before his repentance was not of God, but for the tyme abode in death, & ſo had neither Charity, nor (according to Prot.) Faith.

(39) *Apoc 2. 4.*
(40) *Serm. vp. the Sacram. p. 24. Knox. ag. the Aduerſaries of Gods Prod. p. 219.*

Some anſwere herunto, that Dauids faith was not loſt, but

(41) *2. Reg. 11. 4. 15.* (42) *1. Io. 3. 10.* (43) *1. Io. 3. 14.*

but was for the tyme, as it were ſleeping: but this is no anſwere, but the begging of the thing in queſtion fully confuted by the premilles; for if Dauids Charity was loſt by his Murther, then was his faith alſo not only ſleeping, but likewiſe loſt, ſeeing according to Prot. faith cannot be without Charity: Alſo if Dauid during his forſaid ſleeping in that Sinne, was thereby (44) *the ſeruant of ſinne, and* (45) *of the Deuill*, and alſo (as before) *not of God but abead in death*, his faith and Charity were then for the tyme loſt. Laſtly the nature of faith is not to be ſleeping or idle, but (46) *working by Charity, and* (47) *without workes dead.*

(44) Io.8.34. 2.Pet.2.19. Rom.6.16.
(45) 1.Io.3.8.
(46) Gal.5.6.
(47) Iac.2. 17.26.

Others do anſwere, that, (48) *Dauid when he committed adultery was and remayned the Child of God, and* (49) *did not faile from his faith*: But as Beza and Baſtingius do moſt groſly affirme, (50) *at one and the ſame tyme he ſinned and ſinned not.* And therfore (ſaith Beza (51) *he ſinned not wholly, but ſo far forth as not regenerate.* To ſuch abſurd and inexplicable difficulties are they driuen through the cleereſt words of Scripture.

(47) *Fulk. in Diſp. in the Tower. 2. Daies conference. c.1.*
(48) *Reſp. ad acta. Col. Montisb. par. alt. p 731.*
(50) *Beza ib. p.137. Baſting. in Comment. of the Catechiſ. Engliſhed. p.124.*
(51) *Ib. p.74.*

All Infants by Baptiſme are truly iuſtifyed, yea without Baptiſme according to ſundry Prot. the Children of the faithfull are truly holy: but how incredible is it, that all the Children of the faithfull, or all ſuch as are baptized are Predeſtinate and cannot ſinne: Beſides hence all Catholickes in their Infancies baptized, ſhould alſo be Predeſtinate, which I thinke few Prot. will admit.

Agayne, Pagans differ from Heretickes in that they neuer had fayth, but theſe hauing had it, haue loſt it; which argueth, that eyther fayth may be loſt, or that there are no hereticks. Laſtly, this doctrine is the beaten path to deſpaire: for if none be truly iuſt, but who is certaine of his perſeuerance, ſo that he is aſſured he ſhall neuer fall, or according to others if he do fall, yet he is aſſured to riſe agayne; how can any of true Iudgment certainly hope himſelfe to be iuſt, ſeeing he daily ſeeth himſelfe and others to fall into diuers ſinnes, euen agaynſt their owne Conſcience?

SECT.

SECT. III.

The Sacred Scriptures expounded by the Fathers agreably with Catholickes, in proofe of our vncertainty of our Predestination and Saluation: As also in proofe that Fayth and Iustice once had, may be lost.

VVHereas Salomon most cleerly auoucheth, that the iust mens (1) workes are in the hand of God, and yet man knoweth not whether he be worthy of loue or hatred, but all things are reserued vncertayne for the tyme to come; S. Hierome in his Cōmentary vpon this place sayth: *The sense is, I haue found the workes of the iust to be in the hands of God, but whether they be beloued of God or not, now they cannot know &c.* And his Translation heereof according to the sense of the Hebrew is, that, *Man knoweth not whether he be worthy of hatred or loue.*

(1) Eccl. 9 2.
(2) Ps. 118. 19.
(3) Ser. 5. in. Ps. 118.
(4) Ps. 42. 7.

S. Ambrose writing vpon those words of the psalme, (2) *Take away my reproch which I haue feared*, speaketh thus: *He* (3) *would haue his reproch taken away, which he feared, eyther because he had thought it in hart, and had not done it; and though it were taken away by Pennance, yet he feared left peraduenture his reproch yet remayned, and therefore he prayeth God to take it away, because he alone knoweth that, which he who did it, can be ignorant of.* And he addeth in proofe heerof the words of S. Paul, *I am not guilty in Conscience of any thing, but I am not iustified heerein.*

S. Austine expounding those wordes of King Dauid, (4) *My soule is troubled towards my selfe*, writeth: (5) *I know that the iustice of my God remayneth, but whether myne remayne, I know not. For the Apostle terrifyeth me saying He that thinketh himselfe to stand, let him take heed lest he fall.* And (6) *though holy men may be assured of the reward of their perseuerance yet they are found vncertayne of their owne perseuerance; for what man knoweth that he is to perseuer vnto the end, in the action and progresse of Iustice, vnles by some reuelation he be assured from him who by his iust & hidden Iudgment, doth not instruct all heerein but deceyueth no man.* Yea, (7) *who amongst all the faythfull as long as he liueth in this mortality, can presume himselfe to be in the number of the Predestinate? Because it is* neces-

(4) In Ps. 42.
(5) De Ciu. Dei. l. 21. c. 25.
(7) L. de Cor. & Grat. c. 13.

neceßary that to be hid in this place, where pryde is ſo to be taken heed of, that euen ſo great an Apoſtle was to be buffeted by the Angell of Satan, leſt he ſhould be puffed vp. Agayne, (8) *It is profitable to all or moſt for their ſound humility, that they may not know what heereafter, they are to be: to this end it is ſayd. he that ſeemeth to ſtand, let him take heed leſt he fall.* And, (9) *Why is it graunted to ſome, that they be taken out of the daungers of this lyfe whyle they are iuſt, and others that are iuſt do liue longer in the ſame dangers, vntill they fall from Iuſtice? Who knoweth the ſenſe of our Lord?*

(8) Ep. 107. ad Vital.
(9) De Prædeſt. Sanctorum. c. 14.

And whereas S. Paul before pronounced himſelfe not to be aſſured, but carefull, *If by any meanes, I may come* (ſayth he) *to the reſurrection which is from the dead*; S. Chryſoſtome from hence thus inferreth (10) *If Paul who ſuffered ſo much, was not yet ſecure of that reſurrection: what ſhall we ſay?* Vpon theſe words of the Prophet Ionas, (11) *Who knoweth if God will conuert and forgiue*; S. Hierome writeth, *Therefore it is put doubtfull and vncertayne, that whileſt men are doubtfull of their ſaluation they may more ſeriouſly do Pennance, and more prouoke God to mercy.* S. Auſtine alledging the ſame place ſaith: (12) *It is vncertayne, ſeeing is is ſayd, who knoweth? They haue done Pennance for that which is vncertaine, and haue deſerued certayne mercy.*

(10) Ho. 11. in Ep. ad Philip.
(11) Io. 3. 9.
(12) In. Pſ. 50.

S. Gregory is ſo playne heerin, that Caluin reproueth him for his teaching that, (13) *We are vncertayne of our Election.* But I will conclude with S. Bernard, (14) *Who* (ſayth he) *can ſay I am elect, I am of the Predeſtinate to lyfe, I am of the number of the Sonnes? Who I ſay, can ſay theſe things the Scripture gaynſaying, Man knoweth not if he be worthy of loue or hatred? We haue not certainty, but the confidence of hope comforteth vs, that we be not wholy tormented with the anxiety of this doubt.* Agayne, (15) *Our Lord knoweth who are his, but what man knoweth, whether he be worthy of loue or hatred?*

(13) Inſtit. printed Argentor. 1539. c. 8. de Prædeſt. & Prouid. Dei. p. 260.
(14) Ser. 1. de Septuag.
(14) Ser. 2. in Octaua Paſchæ.

SECT.

SECT. IV.

That ſundry Prot. do teach from the ſacred Scriptures the vncertainty of our Predeſtination and Saluation: and that Fayth and Iuſtice once had may be loſt.

M. Perkins, though our Aduerſary in this point, yet neuertheles confeſſeth, aſwell of the Elect: that, (1) *This teſtimony of being perſuaded that we are adopted and choſen in Chriſt &c. is weake in moſt men, and can ſcarcely be perceiued:* As alſo the reprobate, that, (2) *They may do outwardly all things which true Chriſtians do:* that, *they do willingly ſubiect themſelues to the Miniſtery of the Word, are as forward as any, & as ioyfull in frequenting Sermons, and do condemne them of impiety, which be negligent hearers of the word; they are alſo voyd of Hipocriſy, and beerein diſſemble not that fayth which they haue not, but rather ſhew that (tayth) which they haue.* And all this ſo truly and vnfaignedly, that, (3) *A man being in this Eſtate may deceyue himſelfe, and the moſt goodly in the world, which haue the greateſt guifts of diſcerning how they and their brethren ſtand before the Lord.* Marke heere the beſt ſignes of an elected Puritane, which yet according to M. Perkins a Reprobate may haue.

(1) In his 4. Treatiſes to be conſidered of Chriſtians. Treat. 4. ſect. 14.
(2) Ep. to the reader.
(3) Ibid.

Zanchius confeſſeth that, (4) *Who thoſe may be which are to be ſaued, God truly knoweth: but by the Ghoſpell he doth not teach it; and this becauſe it is not expedient.* Now if God doth not reueyle this by the Ghoſpell, Prot. eyther haue not fayth of their Saluation, or they haue it by ſome other meanes then the Ghoſpell. What then can that be but the Diuell and Preſumption, let any man iudge.

(4) *Tom. 2. l. 2. de Nat. Dei. c. 2.*
(5) Confeſſion of Saxonie in the Harm in Engliſh. p. 80. and ſee p. 211.

Agayne, that fayth and iuſtice may be loſt, the Lutherans teach that, (5) *It is manifeſt that ſome who are regenerate &c. are agayne reiected of God, and made ſubiect to eternall puniſhment.* That (6) *Iuſtification and regeneration may be ſhaken of, and we looſe eternall lyfe.* The Confeſſion of (7) Auſpurge condemneth the contrary doctrine for *Anabaptiſme*. Lobechius (8) defendeth our Catholicke Doctrine, alledging to that end

(6) *Ib. p. 193.*
(7) *Ib. p. 214.*
(8) *Loſp. Theol. p. 317. 318.*

the Confeſſion of Auguſta, and a great number of particular Scriptures, charging the Caluiniſts with *Anabapiſme* in teaching otherwiſe. Chemnitius affirmeth that, (9) *True liuely iuſtifying fayth may be loſt, and the party made guilty of eternall Damnation.* (10) Haſſenrefferus reproueth heerein Caluin & Beza. (11) *That a man truly regenerate* (ſaith Rungius) *may finally fall from the Grace of God and perish, I haue proued by vndoubted teſt monies, and Examples of Scripture.* Schluſſelburge (12) reieɛteth herin Caluin, Zanchius, and the Deuines of Geneua. Adamus Franciſci concludeth from the Scriptures, that (13) *A regenerate man doth looſe faith, & is made guilty of Eternall paine.* Wigandus proueth by many Teſtimonies of Scripture, that, (14) *Fayth may be loſt.* And Melanchthon auoucheth that, (15) *Men fall from Grace, and looſe iuſtifying fayth.* And the ſame truth is taught and defended by ſundry (16) other Lutheran writers, who purpoſely and at large confirme from the ſacred Scriptures this our Catholicke Doctrine, impugning by name many of their owne Brethren for teaching the contrary.

(9) *Exam. part. 2 p. 103. and ſee part. 2. p. 190.*
(10) *Loc. Theol. p. 188. 3. 1.*
(11) *Diſp 7. ex Ep. ad loc. poſter. part. 1. Theſ. 5.*
(12) *Theol. Calu. l. 2. art. 14 fol. 43. &c.*
(13) *Margarita Theol. p. 201 158.*
(14) *Syntagmaex nouo Teſt. col. 732. 733.*
(15) *Confil. Theol. p. 312.*
(16) *Andreas in Epit. Col. Monisth. p. 47. 62. Geſnerus Diſp. 27. pro iib. concord. Diſp. 36. p 151. 156. 257 650. Vorgen. Teſt. de Eccl p 71. Hunnius in Colloq. Ratisb p 433. Chriſtmannus in Diagraphe Electionis p. 125.*

To come now to the Caluiniſtes, Muſculus teacheth that, (17) *If he who hath bene made partaker of the heauenly grace, do fall from that grace, and of a iuſt and faithfull man, do become vniuſt and vnfaithfull &c. this mans Conſcience* (*the purity of faith being loſt*) *is made guilty vnto Damnation.* And then tignifying his diſſent herin, from his other Brethren, concludeth: *I know that in this point ſundry are of another mind, but what my opinion is, I tell freely, without iniury to them.* Rollocks admonition is this, (18) *I tell thee, that notwithſtanding thou art redeemed, and by this bloud of Chriſt freed from ſinne and death, yet if thou take delight in ſinne, the greater ſhall be thy Damnation.* M. Harſnet made a Sermon in proofe herof at Pauls Croſſe And of Hemingius and Snecanus Willet ſayth, (19) *Theſe Patrons of vniuerſall Grace and Conditionall Election, do conſequently bould, that men may looſe their Election and faith, Hemingius p 30. The ſame is alſo maintained by Snecanus. p. 976.*

(17) *Loc.*

Caluin writing vpon theſe words of the Apoſtle, (20) *By faith Moyſes being borne was hid 3 monthes by his Parents, faith* (21) *It is to be noted, that the faith here prayſed was very weake. For*

where

whereas the feare of his death ſet apart, they ought to haue bred him, they expoſe him to danger. It is euident therfore that their faith for a short tyme did not only wauer, but was fallen away. Againe, (22) *Neither do I gainſay, what I lately ſaid, that ſometimes certaine interruptions of faith do happen, as the weaknes therof amongſt violent motions is hither and thither bended. So in the thick darknes of tentations the light therof is choaked.* And in another place, (23) *Let that of Paul be alwaies in your mynd,* (24) *That certaine haue fallen away from faith, becauſe they were turned from a good Conſcience, leſt that we alſo be Examples to others of ſo fearfull a ſhipwracke.*

com. loc de pec. Sect. 5. 29.
(18) Lectures vpon the Colloſſ. Lecture. 6. c. 1. p. 64.
(19) Synop. p. 811.
(20) Heb. 11. 13.

Iohn Huſſe teacheth this Doctrine diſtinctly ſaying, (25) *Here it is doubted whether any trauailer (or man in this life) can be certaine of his owne Predeſtination. And it ſeemeth that not, by that of Eccleſiaſtes 9. No man knoweth whether he be worthy of loue or hatred: To the contrary Peter ſeemeth here to be, ſaying, Make your vocation and Election certaine, and ſo certaine Predeſtination. Here it is to be noted, that no man in this lyfe knoweth certainly without reuelation made to him herof, that he is Predeſtinate, and ſo neither that he is in grace, or his worke to be vertuous.*

(21) In Heb. 11. 13.
(22) Inſtit. l. 3. c. 2. ſ. 24.
(23) Epiſt. 68. cuius init, Heri vt plurimùm.
(24) 1. Tim. 1. 19.

Laſtly D. Luther teacheth that, (26) *No man is ſecure of the truth of his Contrition, much leſſe of the obtayning of plenary remiſſion.* Againe, (27) *Man by any office of the Biſhop is not made ſecure of Saluation, ſeeing neither by the Grace of God infuſed, he is made ſecure of Saluation: but the Apoſtle commandeth vs alwayes to worke our Saluation in feare and trembling.* So that Huſſites, Lutherans, and Caluiniſtes do defend our Catholicke Doctrine of our vncertaine knowledge in this life of our Predeſtination and Saluation.

(25) Ad. c. 1. poſter. Epiſt. D. Petri.
(26) 1 Theſ. 5. 10. Wittemb. Anno 1517. propoſita.
(27) Ep ad Epiſcopum Moguntin.

SECT. V.

Obiections from Scripture in proofe of our certainty of Predeſtination and Saluation, and that faith and Iuſtice cannot be loſt, anſwered.

SOme obiect that, *We* (1) *haue receiued the Spirit of Adoption of Sonnes, wherin we cry Abba Father, for the ſpirit himſelfe gi-*

(1) Rom. 8. 15. 17.

ueth teſtimony to our Spirit, that we are the ſonnes of God. And if Sonnes, heyres alſo &c. yet if we ſuffer with him, that we alſo may be glorifyed with him. Anſw. The teſtimony which the ſpirit giueth is not by any Reuelation, but by a certaine feeling and experiment of internall Comfort, and peace of Conſcience, which begetteth a hopefull, yet coniecturall knowledge: And though it be moſt true, that the Iuſt during their preſent Eſtate of Iuſtice are the Sonnes of God, and ſo alſo heires; yet, which is the only point in queſtion, that the Iuſt may not finally fall, or that the Heire may not for his after vnworthines be diſinherited, is not ſo much as inſinuated in this place: And the contrary might eaſily be proued by the example of Lucifer, and the other Angels who fell from heauen, (2) and were during their aboad there, and before their ſinnes, the Children of God, and yet afterwards by ſinne fell from that ſtate. And the ſame is heere plainly taught, in that theſe ſayings are but deliuered with this forſaid annexed Condition, *if we ſuffer with him*: which like Condition to be neceſſarily euer vnderſtood in all other ſayings, where it is expreſly wanting, is once for euer ſufficiently explained by God himſelfe in theſe words, (3) *If I ſhall ſay to the iuſt, that liuing he ſhall liue, and he truſting in his Iuſtice, do iniquity, all his Iuſtices ſhalbe forgotten, and in his iniquity &c. ſhall be dye. And if I ſhall ſay to the impious, Dying thou ſhalt dye, and he do Pennance from his ſinne &c. liuing, he ſhall liue, and not dye.*

(1) *Iſa.14. 12.1. Pſ.2.4.*
(2) *Ezech.33. 32.4.*
(4) Defence of the Apologie. p.78.
(5) *Rom.8.38.*
(6) *Rom.8. 28.29.30. &c.*
(7) *L.de Correp. & Gra. c.7.*
(8) *Comment. in hunc locum. Hier. Ep. ad Algaſiam. q.9.*
(9) Tranſlation of the New Teſt. in Latin, printed Londini 1587 Kinned. in his Redempt. of mank. p. 365.

Iewell (4) obiecteth theſe words of S. Paul, (5) *I am ſure that neither death nor lyfe &c. ſhalbe able to ſeparate vs from the Charity of God.* Anſw. In the (6) precedent verſes it is cleere, that S. Paul ſpeaketh of the Predeſtinate in generall, and ſo lykewiſe is this place expounded by (7) S. Auſtine; now of the Saluation of theſe in generall no man doubteth. Secondly if S. Paul ſpake of himſelfe in particular, and of others lyke vnto himſelfe, yet by thoſe words, *Certus ſum, I am ſure*, (8) S. Ambroſe and S. Hierome vnderſtand, *I am perſuaded*, or *I truſt*: and the Greeke word πέπεισμαι, which S. Paul heere vſeth doth ſo certainly ſignify, *perſuaſus ſum, I am perſuaded*, that (9) Beza, Kinnedoncius, and our Engliſh Bibels

bles of Anno 1576. and 1590. do accordingly ſo tranſlate it: and ſo the certainty which this text affoardeth, is not of faith, but of perſuaſion or hope; in reſpect whereof, in the ſame Chapter it is ſayd, (10) *we are ſaued by hope.* Thirdly, though this certainty were of knowledge and fayth, yet it is impertinent to that particular knowledge which Prot. pretend, which according to (11) them, extendeth to euery man for himſelfe only, but not concerning any other: whereas, though Iewell corruptly for his purpoſe tranſlateth, *ſhalbe able to remoue me*; S. Paul yet ſayd, *ſhalbe able to remoue vs*, thereby profeſſing to know as much of others, as of himſelfe which in ſundry other verſes he there explaineth to be the Elect in generall. Laſtly S. Paul elſwhere ſayth, *And* (13) *I my ſelfe alſo, my brethren, am aſſured* (certus ſum) *of you, that you alſo are full of loue, replenished with all knowledge &c.* And yet no man will ſay, that he believed with certainty of faith, that all the Romanes were full of loue, and of all knowledge: & the ſame phraſe and ſenſe is vſed in (14) other places of Scripture.

(10) Rom. 8. 24.

(11) Beza Annot. in Nou. Teſt. in ep. ad Rom. 11. c. 2.

(13) Rom. 15. 14.

(14) Luc. 20. 9. Heb. 6. 9.

Others further obiect that, (15) *We haue receyued not the Spirit of this world, but the Spirit that is of God: that we may know the things that of God are giuen vs.* Anſw. This is not ſpoken of the knowledge of thoſe benefits which belong to this or that man in particular, but of thoſe which are beſtowed vpon true believers in generall, in this tyme of Grace, as to know Chriſts Incarnation, Paſſion, & the ioyes of heauen, which Pagans, Iewes, and Heretikes being ignorant of, do deryde.

(15) 1. Cor. 2. 12.

Some vrge thoſe words of S. Paul, (16) *Try your owne ſelues if you be in the fayth: proue yee your ſelues: know you not your ſelues that Chriſt Ieſus is in you, vnles perhaps you be reprobate.* Anſw. 1. Though a man might know or feele the act of fayth to be in himſelfe (becauſe it is an act of our vnderſtanding, which is all that this place affordeth) yet that this fayth may not be afterwards loſt, which is the point queſtionable, remayneth heerby vnproued. 2. As concerning the Corinthians knowledge, that Chriſt was in them, the ſenſe is not of Chriſtes being in them, according to his grace of Iuſtification (for then would not S. Paul ſo grieuouſly haue repre-

(16) 2. Cor. 13. 5.

hended and threatned them as in (17) ſeuerall places of the ſame Epiſtle he doth) but of his being in them (18) *in ſignes, wonders, and mighty deeds*, which if they did not aknowledge, they were reprobates.

(17) In this and the three precedent Chapters.

(18) 2. Cor. 12. 12.

Laſtly, ſuppoſe it were vnderſtood of Chriſtes being in them by his grace of Iuſtification, yet this only argueth for the tyme preſent, but as concerning their future knowledge of their finall perſeuerance in that eſtate, & not falling afterwards from thence, this place yieldeth no colour. And euer remember theſe wordes of the ſame Apoſtle, (19) *We be made partakers of Chriſt; yet ſo if we keepe the beginning of his ſubſtance* (or fayth) *firme vnto the end*.

(19) Heb. 3. 14.

Agayne it is vrged that, (20) *we know that we are tranſlated from death to life becauſe we loue the Brethen*, (21) *In this we know that we abide in him & he in vs, becauſe he of his Spirit hath giuē to vs.* (22) *Theſe things I write to you, that you may know that you haue eternall lyfe which believe &c.* Anſw. The word (*know*) doth not neceſſarily import infallible knowledge by fayth, but likewiſe that which is gathered by hopeful ſignes & coniectures. But in particular to the two former places, I ſay, that though the Apoſtle ſpeaketh in the firſt perſon, becauſe he cōfidently hoped himſelfe to be one of them who loued the brethren and had the Spirit of God, yet his ſayings are generall, ſignifying theſe to be tranſlated from death to life, who loue their brethren, and thoſe to abyde in God and God in them who haue the Spirit of God. Now thoſe are ſaid *to loue the brethren*, or, (23) *the Children of God, who loue God and keep his Commandements*; which ſeeing Proteſtants thinke impoſſible, inſteed of certainty of their Saluation, they were rather to believe the impoſſibility thereof. To the third place, to omit that by *lyfe eternall*, S. Iohn may be ſayd to meane the knowledge of God, which true believers haue, according as elswhere he writeth, (24) *This is life eternall, that they know thee &c.* I further anſwere that thoſe who believe, haue eternall lyfe, not in deed (not being actually in heauen) but in hope only, according as it is ſayd, (25) *We are ſaued by hope*; for to the obtaining of it actually, is requiſite our perſeuerāce in faith, which none can promiſe to himſelf: & I haue formerly proued, that true Faith may finally be loſt.

(20) 1. Io. 3. 14.

(21) 1. Io. 4. 13.

(22) 1. Io. 5. 13.

(23) 1. Io. 2. 2.

(24) Io. 17. 3.

(25) Rom. 8. 24.

O.

Others yet vrge that, (26) *whome he called, them also he iustified, and whom he iustified, them also he glorifyed:* therefore he who is once Iustifyed, is Elect and so cannot finally fall. Answ. This proueth no more of him that is iustifyed, then of him that is called, for the words respect both a like: Now that euery one who is called, is not elect, appeareth in that, (27) *Many are called but few elect*; the words therefore are to be vnderstood not of euery one who is called or iustifyed in generall, but only (as (28) is signifyed) of the Elect, whome in his forknowledge, he (29) *foreknew*, to be (30) *according to purpose called:* & of these we grant none do finally fall but who these are who can know? For (31) *who hath knowne the mynd of our Lord? or who hath been his Counsailour?*

Willet (32) obiecteth these places, (33) *Without repentance are the guifts and vocation of God*; (34) *whereas he had loued his &c vnto the end he loued them.* (35) *My father that which he hath giuen me is greater then all, and no man can plucke them out of the hand of my Father:* therfore he who is once in Grace shall perseuer vnto the end. Answ. Though God doth not for his part repent him of his goodnes in bestowing his guiftes vpō vs, yet in regard of our abuse of them, it is sayd (according to our capacity) that he doth (36) *repent* him: Also the benefit of our calling heere mentioned, which (as before is proued) may be cast off, argueth and explayneth, that his other guiftes lykewise heere mentioned, may in like manner also be lost. As to the second, it is most true, that Christ for his part *loueth to the end:* and so he (37) *loued* the rich man who went away from him, and yet this argued not that mans Election. And it may not be imagined, that God is wanting in his loue to all sinners, as they are his (38) Creatures, though he hate their Sinne. To the third, Christ said, (39) *Whome thou gauest me, haue I kept, and none of them perished, but the Sonne of Perdition*: whereby is cleete that all whome God giueth, do not perseuere: the meaning therefore only is, that neyther the Diuell, nor his Instruments can perforce take them away, but only their owne voluntary assēt to fall 2. Admit, that the place obiected were to be vnderstood ot the Elect in generall (whose finall perseuerance God

(26) *Rom.8. 30.*
(27) *Mat.22. 14.*
(28) *Rom.8. 33.*
(29) *Ver.29.*
(30) *Ver.28.*
(31) *Rom.11. 34.*
(32) *Synop.p. 516.*
(33) *Rom.11. 29.*
(34) *Io.13. 1.*
(35) *Io.10.29.*
(36) *Gen.6.6. 2.Reg.13.23.*
(37) *Mar.10. 21 22. and see Mat.19.22.*
(38) *Sap.11.25.*
(39) *Io.17.12.*

God forknoweth) of whome, we confeſſe none doth periſh, for God is (40) not deceiued in his forkwnowledge, and yet as (41) Fathers, and (42) Prot. teach, things are not, becauſe God did forknow them, but becauſe they are, God therefore doth forknow them. This I ſay doth not proue, eyther that euery one who is once faythfull or iuſtifyed is Elect, or that ſuch as are Elect, ſhould know themſelues in particular to be Elect.

Willet (43) and others further vrge that S. Paul ſayth, (44) *I haue conſummate my courſe &c. there is laid vp for me, a Crowne of Iuſtice, which our Lord will render to me in that day, a iuſt Iudge.* So aſſured was S. Paul of his owne ſaluation. Anſw. M. Perkins confeſſeth, that both Catholikes & Prot. do (45) hould that a man may be aſſured of his Saluation through extraordinary reuelation, as Abraham and others were. But this is impertinent to Prot. pretended knowledge by (46) ordinary fayth: and that S. Pauls knowledge heere vrged was extraordinary, appeareth by his like foreſayd knowledge ſignifyed in this very ſame place of the tyme of his *reſolution* (or death) *being at hand*: As alſo (by lyke reuelation) he ſayd in like manner to the Epheſians, (47) *Behould, I do know that you ſhall no more ſee my face, all you.* To omit then, that this place doth more cleerly conuince merit and reward of good workes, it maketh no more for our certainty of Saluatiõ by ordinary fayth, then it doth for the certayne knowledge of the tyme of our death, for it concerneth both theſe a like, and therefore proueth eyther both, or neyther.

Kinnedoncius (48) obiecteth, that S. Peter aduiſeth vs thus, (49) *Labour the more that by good workes you may make ſure your vocation and Election.* Anſw. 1. Omitting how forcible this text is for Iuſtification by workes, I demand, Be not the faythfull already certaine of their Election by their fayth, but are they yet to ſeeke for this certainty therof from their workes? If ſo: What more plaine againſt Proteſtants pretended certainty by fayth, or to proue that the certainty of Gods Promiſe dependeth but vpon our workes, and therefore is to vs but conditionall, as the text there yet further explayneth, (50) for doing theſe things you ſhall not ſinne. This

text

(40) *Aug. de Correp. & Grat. c. 7.*
(41) *Hier. in c. 26. Hier. Aug. To. 7. de Prædeſt. & Grat. c. 15. de ciu. Dei. l. 5. cap. 9.*
Tom 1. de lib. Arb. l. 3. c. 4. Tom 7. Hypog. l. 6.
(42) *Hiper. Method. Theol. l. 1. p. 310 Amand. Polan. partit. Theol. l. 1. p. 8. & in Diſp. de Prouid. Dei. ſect 38. 39. 40.*
(43) *Synop. p. 557. Kinned in his Redempt of Mank. p. 74.*
(44) *2. Tim. 4. 7 8.*
(45) *Refor. Cath p. 38.*
(46) *Perk. ib. p. 19.*
(47) *Act. 20. 25.*
(48) *Redempt of Mank. p 182.*
(49) *2. Pet. 1. 10.*
(50) *2. Pet. 1. 11.*

text obiected is ſo litle fauouring to Prot. that (51) Fulke & others do purpoſely omit this reheatſall of *good workes*, though they be tranſlated as parcell of the text by other (52) Proteſtants, and in all Latine Copies, and ſome Greeke alſo, as Beza confeſſeth. In ſo much that the other foreſayd omiſſion is moſt weakely excuſed, not defended by D. (53) Fulke.

D (54) Fulke vrgeth, that the *Epheſians* (55) *were ſigned with the holy Spirit of promiſe, which is the pledge of our Inheritance.* And, (56) *Grieue not the Spirit of God, in which you are ſigned vnto the day of redemption.* Anſw. *By the Spirit* heere is only meant the holy Ghoſt, (57) promiſed, and (58) giuen to them in (59) their Confirmation. 2. By the foreſayd ſigning and pledge of Inheritance, there can be no further vrged, but the conuention or promiſe made vpon Gods part, the performance whereof is on his behalfe moſt certayne: but that the Epheſians were heereby aſſured to performe the condition required on their part, is not ſo much in this place as intimated; but they rather in regard of the contrary are heere premoniſhed not to *grieue the Spirit*; and ſo accordingly it is elſwhere ſayd, (60) *they prouoked to wrath, and afflicted the Spirit of his holy One*: they (61) *reſiſted the holy Ghoſt*: and (62) *ſome who were once illuminated, haue taſted alſo the heauenly guift, and were made partakers of the holy Ghoſt &c. are fallen &c.* So weake are the Obiections made by Prot. from Scripture for their infallible knowledge of their Predeſtination and Saluation.

(51) In his Tranſlat. againſt the Rhem. Teſt. and the Engliſh Tranſlat. of Anno 1576. and Beza of 1587.
(52) Kinned. in his redemp. of mank. p. 382.
(53) Againſt Rhem. Teſt. fol. 442.
(54) Againſt Purgat. p. 15.
(55) *Eph.* 1. 13. 14.
(56) *Eph.* 4. 30.
(57) *Luc.* 24. 49.
(58) *Act.* 2. 4.
(59) *Act.* 19. 2. 6.
(60) *Eſa.* 63. 10.
(61) *Act.* 7. 51.
(62) *Heb.* 6. 4. 6.

CHAP. XXXV.

The True State of the Queſtion, concerning the formall Cauſe of Iuſtification.

Whether the formall Cauſe of mans Iuſtification is any Vertue, or Grace infuſed by God, and inherent in the Soule: or that it conſiſteth only in Chriſtes not imputation of Sinne, or in the only remiſſion of Sinne without any infuſion of Grace.

SECT. I.

Catholike Doctrine.

(1) Concil. Trid. Seſſ. 6. c. 7.

THe Catholicke Church Decreeth, that (1) *Iuſtification is not only remiſſion of ſinnes, but alſo Sanctification & renouation of the interiour man, by the voluntary receiuing of grace and guiftes, wherby man of vniuſt, is made iuſt, and of an Enemy a friend &c. The Cauſes of this Iuſtification are; The final, the Glory of God and Chriſt, and life eternall; The efficient, our mercifull God &c. The meritorious the moſt beloued only begotten Sonne our Lord Ieſus Chriſt &c the inſtrumentall, the Sacrament of Baptiſme &c. The only formall cauſe is the Iuſtice of God, not wherewith himſelfe is iuſt, but wherc-*

wherwith he maketh vs iuſt, by which we, being beſtowed vpon vs by him, are renewed in the ſpirit of our mynd, and are not only reputed, but truly called, and are iuſt, euery one receyuing Iuſtice in vs, according to his meaſure, which the Holy Ghoſt deuideth to euery one as he will, and according to the proper diſpoſition and cooperation of euery one. For although no man can be iuſt, to whom the Merits of the Paſſion of our Lord Ieſus Chriſt are not communicated: yet, that is done in this Iuſtification of the wicked, whileſt by the merits of the ſame moſt ſacred Paſſion the Charity of God by the Holy Ghoſt is powred into their hartes who are iuſtifyed, and inhereth in them: Wherupon in the Iuſtification it ſelfe, with remiſsion of ſinnes, man by Ieſus-Chriſt, to whom he is ingrafted, receiueth all theſe things together infuſed, Faith, Hope, and Charity. And therfore, (2) If any ſhall ſay, men, without the Iuſtice of Chriſt by which he merited to vs, to be iuſtifyed, or that by it they are formally iuſt, Anathema. (3) If any ſhall ſay, men to be iuſtifyed, either by only imputation of Chriſtes Iuſtice, or by only remiſsion of Sinnes, excluding grace and Charity, which by the holy Ghoſt is powred into their hartes; or that grace wherby we are iuſtifyed, is only the fauour of God, Anathema.

(1) Can. 10.

(2) Can. 11.

(3) Can. 11.

In the ſecond Mileuitane Councell it is decreed, that, (4) *Whoſoeuer ſhall ſay, the Grace of God wherin we are iuſtifyed by our Lord Ieſus Chriſt, to be of force only for remiſsion of Sinnes already committed, but not to the help that they may not be committed, Anathema.*

(4) Cap. 3.

All (5) Catholickes with one conſent teach, that the formall cauſe of mans Iuſtification is not Gods iuſtice wherby himſelfe is formally iuſt, nor Chriſtes Iuſtice imputed to vs, nor only remiſſion of Sinne, or Gods not imputation of it; but it is Gods Iuſtice wherby he maketh vs truly iuſt by infuſing into our ſoules the ſacred vertues of Faith, Hope, and Charity.

(5) Bellar. de Iuſtif. l. 2. c. 2. Rhem Teſt. in Act. c. 22.

(6) S. Tho. 1. q. 110. art. 3. Dom. Soto. l. 2. de Nat. & Gra. c. 17. 18.

(7) Alex. Halenſ. in Sum p. 2. q. 69. mem. 2. art. 4.

Points Diſputable.

All agreeing, that man is iuſtifyed by Grace infuſed: (6) Some teach that this Grace is a habit really diſtinct from Charity, hauing for her ſubiect the Subſtance of the Soule, as Charity the Will. (7) Others diſtinguiſh them not really,

but formally. (8) Others thinke them to differ in nothing but only in name.

(8) *Durand. 1 Dist. 20. q 1. 8.*

All alſo teaching, that according to the ordinary courſe, mortall ſinne cannot be forgiuen but by the guift of grace: yet ſome (10) thinke, that God by his abſolute power may remit ſinne without all Grace. But others probably teach, that without iuſtifying grace, ſinne cannot be remitted by Gods abſolute power.

(10) *Scotus 2. Dist. 28. q 1. & 4. Dist. 1. q. 6.*

Proteſtants Vntruthes.

Chemnitius tragically complaineth, that we take away the force of Iuſtification from the merits of Chriſt, and aſcribe it to our vertues and qualities. But truly we aſcribe it to the Grace of God as the formall cauſe, and to the merits of Chriſt as the meritorious cauſe.

(11) *Cajet 2. 2. q 113. art. 2.*

(12) *In Antid. ad Seſſ. 6.*

Caluin affirmeth, that according to our Doctrine, (12) *Our Iuſtification conſiſteth partly vpon imputation partly vpon qualitie.* But we (13) teach that there is only one formall cauſe of Iuſtification, which is the Iuſtice of God, infuſed and inherent in vs.

(13) *Conc. Trid. Seſſ. 6. Cap. 7.*

Proteſtant Doctrine.

Caluin ſetteth downe the Prot. Doctrine in theſe wordes, (14) *We ſimply do expound Iuſtification to be acceptation, wherby God houldeth vs receiued into his Grace for iuſt: And we affirme, that it conſiſteth in remiſsion of ſinnes, and the imputation of Gods Iuſtice.* The ſame is taught by (15) Beza, and ſundry others.

(14) *Inſtit. l. 3 c. 11. §. 2.*

(15) *In Mat. 22. 37. Zuing. in Luc. 1. Zanchius tom. 2. li. 2. de Nat. Dei. c. 2.*

D. Humphrey ſetteth downe the Engliſh reformed doctrine thus, (16) *That which we ſay and teach of Grace infuſed, that is of Inherent Iuſtice; in vs there is no habit gotten, no vertue ingraffed, no quality infuſed, no iuſtice wherwith we may be iuſtifyed before God inherent in vs; but all iniquity, all rebellion, contumacy of the fleſh is ingraffed and inherent.* So that in a perfect Prot. iuſtifyed, regenerate, predeſtinate, there is no vertue infuſed by God, or inherent in his Soule, but ſtill it remayneth ſtayned

(16) *Adrat. 2. Camp. p. 142.*

and

and ſtored with all iniquity, all rebellion and contumacy of the fleſh, theſe only being ingraffed and inherent in her.

Proteſtantes agree with Ancient Heretickes.

The deniall of Inherent Iuſtice was condemned in Iulian the Pelagian by S. Auſtine, ſaying, (17) *Thou doſt not depart from thy opinion wherin thou affirmeſt, the Grace of God to conſiſt in the only remiſsion of Sinnes.* And the ſame errour was reiected by Cæleſtinus (18) and the Mileuitane Councell. And for the ſame was cenſured (19) Proclus, and the (20) Meſſalians.

Proteſtant Errours.

The French Hugonots teach that, (21) *Euen thoſe who excell in Sanctity are defyled with many ſinnes as long as they conuerſe in this world.* Caluin (22) *Let vs certainly know, that although we be wicked and impure, yet the Lord to acknowledge and receiue, yea and to eſteeme vs for iuſt.* Whitaker (23) *We affirme our Iuſtice to be the hyding of the Sinne.* And, (24) *Remiſsion pardoneth the puniſhment* (but) *doth not actually take away, or remoue all the fault.* Piſcator, (25) *forgiuenes of the fault is nothing elſe, then not to puniſh for the fault.*

Hence alſo Luther teacheth that, (26) *A Chriſtian is as good and holy as Peter and Paul, neyther is any man greater or better then he.* (27) *S. Peter is not better then the thiefe vpon the Croſſe: Mary the Mother of God doth not excell Mary the ſinner.* (28) *We are as holy as Mary and other Saintes.* Paræus (29) *By Chriſtes iuſtice imputed to vs we are accounted no leſſe iuſt then Chriſt himſelfe, proportion at leaſt being kept of the members and the head.* So that euery faythfull Prot. is as holy and iuſt, as S. Peter, S. Paul, the B. Virgin, yea as Chriſt himſelfe, a litle proportion being obſerued.

(17) *Conf. Iul. Pelag. l. 6. c. 11.*
(18) *Ep. 1. c. 10. Conc. Mil. c. 3. Aug. l. 1. Retract c. 13. & ep. 106.*
(19) *Epiph. har. 64.*
(20) *Theod. l. 4. de har. Fab.*
(21) *Confeſſ. Gal. Art. 12.*
(22) *Lib. de cœna. p. 2.*
(23) *Ad rat. 8. Camp. p. 18.*
(24) *L. 4. de pec. Orig.*
(25) *In Theſ. l. 2 p. 428.*
(26) *Tom. 7. in Mat. 7. fol. 96.*
(27) *Poſtil. in Dom. 24. fol. 346.*
(28) *In Poſt. Natiu. Mariæ, fol. 416.*
(29) *De Iuſtif. l. 2. c. 7. p. 470.*

SECT.

SECT. II.

It is proued by Scriptures, that the formall Cauſe of mans Iuſtification is true vertue and Grace inherent: & that it doth not conſiſt only in Chriſtes not imputation of Sinne, or in the only remiſsion of Sinne.

TO make tryall of the truth in this queſtion by the Scriptures, S. Paul writeth, (1) *For if in the offence of one, death*
(1) Rom. 5. 17. *raigned by one: much more they that receyue the abundance of Grace and of donation and of Iuſtice, ſhall raygne in lyfe by one Ieſus-Chriſt. Therefore as by the offence of one vnto all men to condemnation: ſo alſo by the Iuſtice of one vnto all men to Iuſtification of life. For as by the diſobedience of one man, many were made ſinners: ſo alſo by the Obedience of one many ſhalbe made iuſt.* Heere we are ſayd to be made Iuſt by Chriſt, no leſſe then we were made vniuſt by Adam, which was not only by Adams Iniuſtice imputed vnto vs, but by Iniuſtice truly and really inherent in
(2) 1. Cor. 15. 49. our ſelues. Againe, (2) *As we haue borne the Image of the earthly, let vs beare alſo the Image of the heauenly:* but the Image of earthly Adam we haue truly borne by internall Sinne, therefore we muſt truly beare the Image of Chriſt by internall Grace.
(3) Eph. 4. Alſo, (3) *Be renewed in the Spirit of your mynd: and put on the new man, which according to God is created in Iuſtice and Holines of the truth:* heere New man is not ſayd to be imputed to vs, but put on vs, and that not only to the ſight of the world, but according to God, and this in Iuſtice and Holines.
(4) Tit. 3. 5. But what more conuincing then that (4) *God according to his mercy hath ſaued vs by the lauer of regeneration and renouation of the holy Ghoſt, whome he hath powred vpon vs abundantly by Ieſus Chriſt our Sauiour: that being iuſtifyed by his Grace, we may be heires according to hope of life euerlaſting:* heere we are ſayd by Baptiſme to be regenerated and renewed, which cannot be, but by ſome mutation in our ſelues, whereby of hated Enemyes, we become beloued Sonnes.

Such texts alſo confirme this, which teach, that Sinnes are not only couered by Gods not imputation, but are truly taken

taken or blotted out of the Soule by Grace. So K. (5) Dauid prayed, *I beseech thee take away the iniquity of thy seruant* (6) *I haue cleane taken away thyne iniquityes as a cloud, and thy sinnes as a mist.* (7) *I will powre out vpon you cleane water, and you shalbe clensed from all your contaminations.* (8) *Thou shalt sprinkle me with hyssope, and I shalbe clensed; thou shalt wash me, and I shalbe made whyter then snow.* (9) *As farre as the East is distant from the West, hath he made our iniquities far from vs.* (10) *His sinne shalbe sought, and shall not be found.* (11) *By mercy and fayth sins are purged.* (12) *He will returne and haue mercy on vs: he will lay away our iniquities: he will cast all our sinnes into the bottome of the Sea.* (13) *Thou art all fayre, O my loue, and there is not a spot in thee.*

(5) 1. Paral. 21.8.
(6) Isa. 44. 22.
(7) Ezech. 36.25.
(8) Ps. 50.9.
(9) Ps. 102. 12.
(10) Ps. 9.5.
(11) Prou. 15. 27.
(12) Mich. c. 7.19.
(13) Cant. 4.7.

The like phrases are vsed in the New Testament, (14) *Behould the Lambe of God, behould him that taketh away the sinnes of the world.* (15) *Be penitent and conuert, that your sinnes may be put out.* And the like may be seene in (16) sundry other places

(14) Io. 1.29.
(15) Act. 3.19.
(16) 1. Io. 1.7. Act. 22.17. Hebr. 1.3. 2. Cor. 6.11. Eph. 5.8. 27.

Reason also confirmeth this, for doubtles the same iustice is restored vnto vs by the merits of Christ, which he lost in Adam, according to that of S. Paul, (17) *Where sinne abounded, grace did more abound.* And S. Austine affirmeth, (18) *In the inward man renewed by the Grace of Christ, that Iustice to be written, which fault had cancelled:* But all confesse, that Adams Iustice before his fall was not imputatiue, but inherent and true Iustice, which made him gratefull in the sight of God,

(17) Rom. 5. 21.
(18) De Spir. & lit. c. 21. & de Gen. l. 6. c. 21.

Againe, the Iustice wherewith Children baptized are indued, is not the extrinsecall iustice of Christ, apprehended by actuall fayth, which they, wanting reason, cannot haue, but the habits of Fayth, Hope, and Charity: so likewise then are we iustifyed.

Besides, one and the same thing can neuer be the efficient, and formall cause of the same effect: but the Iustice of Christ is the Cause of our Iustification, producing Iustice in vs, for (19) *Of his fulnes we all haue receiued,* according to the measure of his guift: which cannot be vnderstood of imputatiue Iustice, which without proportion of measure is equally referred to euery one, therfore of inherent: whereof Christs Iustice being the efficient, cannot be also the formall cause.

(19) Ioan. 1.16.

In

In like ſort, the Grace wherwith we are here iuſtifyed vpon Earth, is the ſame which ſhalbe Crowned in heauen, for the reward of glory is proportioned to the ſmall or great meaſure of Iuſtice & grace which here we haue. Now, that which is crowned in heauen is certainly inherent, wherwith the Soule is truly beautified for all eternity.

Further, as none can be truly the Obiect of Gods hatred and worthy of Damnation, by meere imputation of fault, vnles he be faulty indeed; ſo none can be the obiect of his loue and worthy of heauen, by extrinſecall imputation, vnles he be truly free from Sinne, and endued with Grace. And as none can liue by the life which is in another, ſo neither can he be formally iuſt, by the iuſtice which is in another. Againe the denomination of a ſubiect is more truly and properly taken from the inherent quality, then from the outward forme; therfore if ſinne doth ſtill inhere in vs, for all Chriſtes imputation, we cannot be truly termed iuſt, holy, innocent, immaculate, the Children of God, the heires of heauen, as we are ſtyled by the Scripture; but rather defyled and wicked ſinners, ſlaues of the Deuill, and worthy of hell. Laſtly Chriſt himſelfe bad vpon Earth, and hath ſtill inherent Iuſtice, and ſo likewiſe his holy Angels; but the members of one myſticall Body partake of one life with the head, (20) *Becauſe you are ſonnes* (ſaith S. Paul) *God hath ſent the ſpirit of his Sonne into your harts.* Thus cleerly do the Scriptures make for inherent Iuſtice.

(20) Gal. 4. 2.

SECT III.

That the Fathers do expound the Scriptures in proofe of Inherent Iuſtice.

S. Auſtine writing vpon thoſe words of the Pſalmiſt, (1) *Thou haſt done Iuſtice and Iudgment in Iacob, exalt yee the Lord our God,* ſaith: (2) *Truly exalt yee, well exalt yee, let vs praiſe and exalt him, who made the Iuſtice which we haue. He made it in vs; for who made in vs iuſtice, but he that iuſtifyeth vs? We therfore vngodly, be*

(1) Pſ. 98. 4.
(2) in Pſ. 98.

be the iuſtifyer, ſeeing he made that iuſtice in vs, wherwith we may pleaſe him. Againe, (3) *He that ſhall beleeue in him, ſhall not haue his owne Iuſtice which is from the law, although the law be good, but he ſhall fulfill the law, not by his owne, but by Iuſtice giuen from God; for Holi. Charity is the fulnes of the law. From whence is that Charity powred into our harts? not truly from our ſelues, but by the holy Ghoſt which is giuen vs.* (3) Ser. 15. de verb. Apoſt.

S. Hierome ſpeaking of Baptiſme, ſaith, (4) *Now thou art made cleane in the lauer, and of thee it is ſaid, who is she that aſcendeth whyte? and let her be waſhed, yet she cannot keep her purity, vnles she be ſtrengthened from our Lord.* But S. Hierome is ſo cleere, that Luther ſaith, (5) *This point which in Chriſtian Doctrine, is to be vndoubtedly eſtablished, that in Saintes ſinne abydeth, was neuer by Hierome vnderſtood.* (4) L. 3. cont. Pelagianos. (5) In Comment. S. Petri. See Cent. 4. c. 10. Col. 1249.

Caluin alſo ſayth of S. Auſtine touching this point, (6) *The very ſentance of Auguſtine, or at leaſt his manner of ſpeaking is not altogether to be receiued.* Chēnitius of many other fathers writeth, (7) *We ſue not proceſſe againſt the Fathers, albeit they commonly take the word (to iuſtify) for the renewing whereby the workes of righteouſnes are wrought in vs.* And, *I am not ignorant, that the Fathers do often vſe the word (iuſtify) in this ſignification,* namely to make inherently iuſt. The Centuriſtes reproue Origen, for that he doth (8) *With open mouth declayme of the Iuſtice of Iob.* They blame Cyprian for ſaying, (9) *He that baptizeth, imparteth the holy Ghoſt, and inwardly ſanctifyeth the baptized.* They affirme of Clemens Alex. that, (10) *In all his writings it appeareth, he neuer knew the force of Originall Sinne, or the inherent malady thereof.* So confeſſed are the Fathers. (6) In H. l. 30. c. 22. §. 13. (7) Exam. part. 2. (8) Cent. 3. c. 8. Col. 78. (9) Ib. Col. 82. (10) Cent. 2. c. 4. Col. 582.

SECT. IV.

That Proteſtant writers do teach the Doctrine of inherent Iuſtice.

LVther, (1) *Theſe things fight one againſt another, a Chriſtian to be iuſt and to be loued of God, and yet at the ſame tyme to be a Sinner: for God cannot deny his owne nature, that is, he cannot but hate ſinne and ſinners, and this he doth neceſſarily. for otherwiſe he ſhould be moſt vniuſt: how then are theſe two contradictories togeather* (1) Tom. 5. in Gal. 3. fol. 315.

true: I haue sinne, and am most worthy of anger & the hatred of God; and the Father loueth me? This absurdity followeth, by affirming a man to be iustified, and yet his sinnes not to be taken away, nor any vertue infused into his Soule.

SECT. V.

Obiections from Scripture against inherent Iustice, answered.

(1) *Cont. Camp rat 8. fol. 124.*
(2) *2. Cor. 5. 22.*

D. Whitaker (1) obiecteth that, (2) *Him that knew no sinne, for vs he made sinne, that we might be made the Iustice of God in him*: therfore seeing Christ was not truly made sinne, but by imputation, so are we no otherwise made iust by him. Answ. Christ is said to *be made sinne*, not that he was truly a sinner himselfe, but that he was made an *hoast*, or Sacrifice, for the taking away of sinne, for so often the word *sinne* is taken in the (3) Scripture, and so our sinnes were imputed to him, in that he did voluntarily vndertake to make satisfaction for them: wherfore as Christ not by the meanes of another, but in his owne person tooke (4) *The similitude of the flesh of sinne*, and was truly made a Sacrifice for sinne, so we not only by Imputation, but truly and really in our selues, ought to be the Iustice of God. S. Austine explaining these former wordes, *that we might be made the iustice of God*, saith: (5) *Euen as when we read Saluation is our Lord, it is not meant that Saluation wherby our Lord is saued; but wherby they are saued whom he saueth: so when it is said, Gods Iustice, that is not to be vnderstood, wherwith God is iust, but that wherwith men are iust, whom by his grace he iustifyeth.*

(1) *Leuit. 4.* 21. 24. *Ezech.* 44. 29. *Ose. 4.* 8.
(4) *Rom. 8. 3.*
(5) *De Spir. & lit. c. 18. & ep. 120. ad Honorat.*

Others obiect, that God, (6) *hath gratifyed vs in his beloued Sonne*, that is, only houldeth vs acceptable in him. Answ. That the word ἐχαρίτωσεν doth truly signify to make *gracious*, S. Chrysostome teacheth saying, (7) *He made vs gracious, that is, he not only freed vs from Synnes, but he also made vs his beloued friends. For if one hauing a man scabbed corrupted with plague, disease, old age, pouerty and hunger, should presently make him a beau-*

(6) *Eph 1 6.*
(7) *In Comment. huius loci.*

tifull

tifull young man, who should excell all in fayrnes, sending out great splendour from his cheekes, and darkning the brightnes of the eyes with reflexions: whome also he should place in the very flower of his age, and should with ball cloath & adorne his [illegible] purple and all things fyne: No otherwise doth Christ make our Soules polished, beautifull, desired, and beloued.

These words also of S. Paul are vrged, (8) *And may be found in him not hauing my Iustice, which is of the law, but that which is of the faith of Christ, which is of Gods Iustice in faith:* as though heerby it should appeare, that the Apostle would haue no Iustice of his owne, but only that Iustice which is in Christ. Answ. S. Paul calleth that a mans *owne Iustice*, which he challengeth by the workes of the law or nature, without the Grace of Christ: and that Gods Iustice (as S. (9) Austine expoundeth this place) not which is in God, or by which God is iust, but that which is in man from God, and by his guilt. (8) Philip. 3. 9.

(9) L. 3. cont. 2. Ep. Pelag. c. 7. De Spir. & lit. c. 9.

CHAP. XXXVI.

The true State of the Queſtion, concerning Iuſtifi-tion by Faith and Workes.

Whether man is truly iuſtifyed by Faith only, or that Hope, Charity, and good Workes are likewiſe cauſes of Iuſtification.

SECT. I.

Catholike Doctrine.

HAVING proued mans Iuſtification to be made by ſome vertues infuſed by God into the Soule; it remayneth now to ſhew what Vertues theſe are wherby man is Iuſtifyed: In manifeſtation wherof the Catholicke Church hath decreed, that, (1) *If any ſhall affirme, the impious man to be iuſtifyed by only faith, ſo as he vnderſtandeth nothing elſe to be required, which may cooperate to the obtaining of the Grace of Iuſtification, and that in no reſpect it is needfull that he be prepared and diſpoſed with the motion of his will, Anathema.* And (2) *If any ſhall ſay that Iuſtice receiued is not preſerued and increaſed before God by good workes; but that the good workes are only fruites and ſignes of Iuſtification already obtained, but not the Cauſe of the increaſing therof, Anathema.*

(1) Concil. Trid. Seſſ. 6. Can. 9.

(2) Can. 24.

In

In the Councell of Moguntia it was defyned, that, (3) *He who after the grace of Iuſtification receiued, falleth againe by ſinne receiueth Iuſtification by the remedies of Pennance: which with remiſſion of ſinnes giueth alſo ſanctification and renouation of the internall man in that by the merits of Chriſts Paſſion, which now is communicated to him that beleeueth with pardon of ſinnes, man alſo receiueth the Grace of God, and by the holy Ghoſt togeather with Faith, Charity alſo and Hope powred into the hart. And theſe guifts of God remayning in him, he is not now only reputed, or named, but truly is iuſt &c.*

(3) Conc. Moguntin. Cap 7. See Conc. Seponenſ. Decret. 16.

Catholickes (4) generally teach that Fayth, Hope, and Charity are the formall cauſe of mans Iuſtification, which is euer further increaſed by good workes, ſo that not only faith, but likewiſe Hope, Charity, and good Workes do all of them concurre, as true cauſes of Iuſtification.

(4) Bellar. de Iuſtif. l. 1. c. 21. Rhem. Teſtam. in Iac. 2.

Proteſtant Vntruthes.

Luther was not aſhamed to ſay, (7) *Our Papiſtes haue neither taught nor vnderſtood any thing of faith.* And, (8) *Shew yee me one place of Iuſtification, of fayth, in the Decrees, Decretals, Clementins, in all the writers of all Summes and Sentences, in all Sermons of Monkes, in Decrees of Councels, in all Poſtils, in all Hierome and Gregory &c.* But whoſoeuer ſhall but looke into theſe bookes by Luther cited, ſhall eaſily fynd that euery one of them will condemne Luther for an impudent Lyar.

(7) Ad. c. 15. Ioan.
(8) In Colloq. Germon. c. de morte.

Melanchton affirmeth that, (9) *The Schoolmen haue taught foolishly and wickedly, Sinnes to be forgiuen by Contrition without faith.* And that (10) *Satisfactions formerly were extolled immoderatly, but no mention was made of faith and the merit of Chriſt, and the Iuſtice of faith.* The ſame iuſt cenſure will all Schoolmen giue of Melanchton, which formerly was giuen of Luther.

(9) In Diſp. de pœnit. propoſ. 7.
(10) In Confeſſ. Auguſt. art. de confeſſ. & in Apol. art. 11. & art. 15.

Proteſtant Doctrine.

The Engliſh Proteſtant Church decreeth, that, (11) *We are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our* Lord

(11) Articles of Relig. art. 11. Calu. Inſtit. l. 3. c. 11. §. 13. 14. 17. 18 19.

Lord and Sauiour Iesus Christ, by faith, and not for our owne workes or deseruings. Wherfore that we are iustifyed by faith only, is a most wholsome doctrine, and very full of comfort. Luther, (12) *Nothing else is required to Iustification, but to beare, and beleiue Iesus Christ our Sauiour.* And, (13) *A Christian needeth no works for this that he may be iust and saued.* Perkins, (14) *The doctrine which dreameth of Iustification by workes bringeth in Idolatry.* And, (15) *It is false & ridiculous, that we are iustifyed by workes.* Whitaker, (16) *That our doctrine is most true and most holy, Man to be iustifyed only by faith.* So that euen Charity by these men is excluded from being any Cause of our Iustification.

(12) De Postil. in Domin. post Natal.
(13) De libert. Christian. fol. 6.
(14) Tom. 2. in Gal. c. 4. Col. 119.
(15) Tom. 1. c. 51. Col. 103.
(16) Ad rat. 3 Camp. p. 7.

Protestants agree with Ancient Hereticks.

S. Austine condemneth certaine of the Pseudoapostles, for that they taught that, (17) *Only fayth sufficeth to gaine Saluation, because S. Paul had said, Man is iustifyed by faith without the workes of the law.* He also (18) reproueth Eunomius, for that he taught that, *The committing or continuing of any sinnes whatsoeuer could nothing hurt any man, if he were partaker of that faith, which was taught by him.* That our moderne Prot. teach the same, Whitaker shall testify: (19) *We say that if any man haue an acte of faith, Sinnes do not hurt him: this truly Luther affirmeth, this we all say.* And for this your saying M. Whitaker, you, and your All are condemned by S. Austine for Heretickes.

(17) De fide & oper. c. 14.
(18) L. de hær. c. 54.
(19) De Ecclesia p. 302.

Protestant Errours.

Faith being vndoubtedly the beginning and foundation of mans Iustification and Saluation, and according to Prot. at sometymes the only cause thereof: yet it is wonderfull to see at other tymes how litle esteeme they make of it: for thus writeth Caluin, (20) *Properly speaking we say, only God to iustify, we compare fayth as it were to a vessell &c. Fayth although of it selfe it be of no worth or price, it doth iustify vs by bringing Christ, euen as a pot full of money doth enrich a man.* Peter Martyr, (21) *If fayth it selfe be considered, as it is our worke, we cannot be iustifyed therwith, seeing it is a worke both lame and imperfect, far worse then the*

(20) Instit. l. 3. c. 11 §. 7.
(21) in loc. Class. 3. c. 4. §. 8.

the law requireth &c. He compareth it, (22) to a hand infected with lepry, infirme, ſcabbed. Danæus, (23) If we conſider Fayth by it ſelfe, and as it is in vs, it is imperfect, lame, polluted, and defyled and mingled with infidelity. ſo that it is not truly worthy the name of Vertue. Paræus, (24) It is no abſurdity, Fayth ſometymes to haue mingled diffidence or incredulity, which is Sinne, and ſo by accident faith to be Sin. And, Fayth iuſtifyeth as the beggar by his ſcabbed hand receyueth almes. Perkins, (25) Saluation doth not depend of our Fayth. Luther, (26) Fayth vnles it be without all, euen the leaſt worke doth not iuſtify; yea it is not faith. Amſdorfius, (27) Good workes euen according to their nature and ſubſtance, as they are commanded by God, are hurtfull to ſaluation. Lutner, (28) Let this be thy rule, where the Scripture commandeth a good worke to be done, ſo vnderſtand it, that it forbiddeth thee to do a good worke, ſeeing thou canſt not do it. (29) A Chriſtian or baptized perſon is ſo rich, that although he would, he cannot looſe his Saluation by any ſinnes how great ſoeuer, vnles he will not beleeue. And this good reaſon he giueth herof elswhere, (30) For only Infidelity condemneth all men that are condemned: and on the contrary, Only Faith maketh all men bleſſed. So that a right Lutheran may liue and dye a Traytour, a murtherer, Adulterer &c. and yet is ſure to be ſaued.

(22) In Rom. 11
(23) In c. 3. Enchir. S. Aug. p. 783.
(24) De Iuſtif. l. 4. c. 17. §. 12. 9.
(25) Tom. 2. in Gal. 3. Col. 119.
(26) Tom. 1. in Diſp. hab. an. 1520. fol 371. Sec Schluſſ. tom. 7 Catal. haret. p. 282. 193.
(27) In Col. loq. Aldeburg. ſcript. 6. p. 111.
(28) Tom. 3. in Pſ. 5 fol. 172.
(29) Tom. 2. Wittemb. de Captiu Babyl. fol. 74.
(30) In 2. part. Poſtil. Germ. fol. 140.

SECT. II.

It is proued by the Sacred Scriptures, that not only Faith, but likewiſe Hope, Charity, and other good Workes do truly iuſtify, and cauſe remiſſion of Sinne.

TO examine this ſo waighty a point by the Scriptures, all ſuch Argumentes taken from Scriptures, as conuince Faith to iuſtify, do likewiſe proue the ſame of the reſt. Of faith it is ſaid, (31) *Without faith it is impoſsible to pleaſe God: for he that cometh to God muſt beleeue that he is, and is a rewarder to them that ſeeke him.* (32) *The Iuſt ſhall liue in his faith.* (33) *In him euery one that beleeueth is iuſtifyed*: and the (24) like. Now anſwerably herto it is ſaid of feare. (35) *The Feare of our Lord expelleth ſinne: for he that is without feare cannot be iuſtifyed.* (36)

(11) Heb. 11. 6.
(32) Abb. 2. 4.
(33) Act 13. 39.
(34) Rom. 3. 27. 28. Gal. 3. 6. 24.
(35) Eccleſ. 1. 27 28.
(36) Philip. 2. 12.

Wilb

With feare and trembling worke your Saluation. Of *Hope.* 37) *He will &c. ſaue them, becauſe they haue hoped in him.* (38) *By hope we are ſaued.* Of *Charity and good Workes,* (39) *Many ſinnes are forgiuen her, becauſe ſhe hath loued much: But to whom leſſe is forgiuen, he loueth leſſe.* (40) *We are tranſlated from death to lyfe, becauſe we loue the Brethren.* (41) *Charity couereth the multitude of Sinnes. By mercy and truth Iniquity is redeemed.* (43) *Almes purgeth Sinne.* (44) *Giue almes, and behould all things are cleane to you.* (45) *Come &c. poſſeſſe the kingdome &c. for I was an hungry &c.* (46) *Redeeme thy ſinnes with almes.* (47) *Labour the more, that by good workes you may make ſure your vocation and Election.* Theſe laſt wordes are ſo cleere for vs, that (48) Luther, Beza, Tremelius, and our Engliſh (49) Prot. do quite leaue out theſe words, *By good workes.* So expreſſe it is, that Almes and good Workes do cauſe remiſſion of ſinnes, and iuſtify.

(37) Pſ.36.40.
(38) Ro 8.24.
(39) Luc.7. 47.
(40) 1.Io.3. 14.
(41) 1.Pet.4. 8. Prou.10. 12.
(43) Prou.16. 6.
(44) Tob.12. 9.
(45) Mat.25. 34.
(46) Dan. 4. 24.
(47) 2.Pet.1. 10.

Becauſe theſe wordes, (50) *Redeeme thy Sinnes by Almes,* do proue that good workes do iuſtify and ſatisfy for Sinne, Geſnerus therefore affirmeth that (51) *This Tranſlation is corrupt.* And yet Peter Martyr auoucheth that the Chaldee, *in which this Epiſtle was written, hath verbatim, Redeeme thy ſinnes in Iuſtice.*: and that, *the Vulgar reading is taken from the Greeke text.*

(48) *In ſuis Biblijs German. & in Comment. in 2. Pet.1. tom. 5.fol.487.*
(49) In the kings Bible.
(50) *Dan.4. 24.*
(51) *Compend. doctr.cal. loc. 23. p.495.*

And whereas concerning this laſt place of Daniel, ſome Prot. for *redeeme,* tranſlate, *breake of*; yet by the iudgment of (52) Hemingius, the Hebrew word ſignifyeth to *redeeme.* S. Hierome heere readeth accordingly, and ſo alſo doth (53) Luther, Peter Martyr, Melanchon, Caluin, Bullinger, with ſundry other Prot, and ſo alſo are ſome of our Engliſh (54) Bybles.

(52) *In Pſ.84. Engliſhed c.6. part.4.p.527.*
(53) *Luth loc. com. claſſ. 1.p. 72. Pet. Mar. in his com. plac. in Eng. part.3.c.4. p. 114. Melanth.loc.com.c.de bon.opib.p.157. Calu.In H. c.5. pa.181. Bull. Dec. in Engl. p.584. Aret.loc. com.p.322.*

This place is ſo conuincing, that Herbrandus ſaith thereof, I anſwere, *If vt iuſte the word be vrged, it is manifeſt the ſenſe of thoſe wordes* (of Daniel) *to fight with the ſcope of the whole Scripture, and with analogy of fayth.* So that according to the literall wordes, the ſenſe directly maketh againſt Proteſtãts. In likeſort wheras Chriſt before ſayd, *Giue Almes, and behould all things are cleane to you,* Prot. in anſwere heerto, do expound the

(54) *Of Anno 1560.*

the ſame in a direct contrary ſenſe. Vallada, (55) *Chriſt is far from teaching, that ſinnes are redeemed by Almes, that to the contrary he derideth and reprehendeth the Phariſees, becauſe they had this opinion.* Peter Martyr, (56) *Theſe words, Giue almes &c. may be expounded 3 waies, firſt, that we decree that it is an Ironicall ſpeach &c.* And the ſame anſwere is giuen by (57) others. But if ſuch Ironicall ſpeaches may be houlden for good, it wilbe eaſy to euade all textes of Scripture though neuer ſo plaine, for any one Article of our Chriſtian faith.

(55) *Apol. cont. Epiſcop. Luzonenſem c. 22. p. 300.*
(56) *In Rom. 11. p. 518.*
(57) *Apol. Confeſſ. Auguſt. c. de reſponſ. ad argumenta. Aret. in loc. part. 1. fol. 90.*

Lutherans expound thoſe wordes, (58) *Becauſe ſhe loued much*, that is, *becauſe ſhe truly worſhipped me with faith, and with the exerciſes and ſignes of faith*, ſtill flying to their ſignes and figures, and ſtrangely confounding Faith and Charity, being vertues moſt diſtinct. Becauſe thoſe wordes of Chriſt, (59) *Many ſinnes are forgiuen her becauſe ſhe loued much*, do make for iuſtification by workes; Beza inſteed of *quoniam, becauſe*, placeth *nam, for.* And this he ſaith he did, that it might more eaſily be vnderſtood, the cauſe of remiſſion of Sinne not to be ſhewed in theſe wordes. Illyricus vpon this place doth follow Beza.

(58) *Apol. Confeſſ. Auguſt. c. de imputatione legis.*
(59) *Luc. 7. 47.*

But what more plaine then thoſe wordes and examples produced by S. Iames, (60) *Abraham &c. was he not iuſtifyed by workes, offering Iſaac his ſonne vpon the Aultar. Seeſt thou that faith did worke with his workes, and by the workes the faith was conſummate &c? Do you ſee that by workes a man is iuſtifyed, and not by faith only?* &c. *Rachab the harlot was ſhe not iuſtifyed by workes* &c? S. Auſtine (61) noteth, that of purpoſe S. Iames tooke the very ſame example of Abraham, whom S. Paul ſaid to be iuſtifyed by faith, and declareth that he was alſo iuſtifyed by workes, ſpecifying the good worke for which he was iuſtifyed, to wit, his obedience, and immolation of his only Sonne.

(60) *C. 2. 21. 22. 24. 25.*
(61) *L. 83. queſt. q. 72.*

Caluin (62) and others do anſwere herto, that here, by *faith* is vnderſtood a barraine and dead faith: But this is to offer violence to the words and meaning; for the Apoſtle hauing tould, *that faith without workes is idle*, alleadgeth in further proofe thereof the example of Abraham iuſtifyed by workes, whoſe faith did worke with his workes, and then

(62) *Inſtit. l. 3. c. 17. ſect. 11. Pulk. again. Rhem. Teſt. fol. 419. And the Marg. notes of the Engl. Bible of 1576. Whitak. cont. Dur. 1. 2. ſect. 13.*

concluding immediatly therupon, *Do you ſee that by workes a man is iuſtifyed and not by faith only*: ſo cleerly is it ſpoken of ſuch faith, as wrought with workes, and wherby Abraham was called the *friend of God*, which cannot be a barraine and dead faith.

(63) *Reform. Cath. p. 92.*

Perkins (63) would euade by affirming, that by the word, *iuſtifyed*, is vnderſtood only our Iuſtification before man: but this is as helples as the former, for the Apoſtle ſaying, *By workes a man is iuſtifyed, and not by faith only*, doth here at once and alyke referre the word *Iuſtifyed*, both to workes & faith: wherfore if by *faith* he meant a true faith, then doth that iuſtify before God; & if a barraine and dead faith without workes, then doth it not iuſtify ſo much as before man. Againe, the Example of Abraham who believed, and it was reputed to him for iuſtice, and who was called the friend of God, conuinceth that this Iuſtification was before God.

(64) *De iuſtif. l. 4. c. 18. p. 1157.*

Paræus his anſwere is, that S. Iames (64) *addeth the Antithesis, or contrary, and not by faith only, by imitation of hypocrites:* But ſo farre was S. Iames from hypocriſy or diſſimulation, that by thoſe wordes he ſpake as plainly and fully for Iuſtification by workes, as any Roman Catholike at this day can do.

(65) *Tom. 6. in c. 12. Gen. fol. 282.*
(66) *Tom. 2. de ſacris Conciouibus fol. 23.*
(67) *In Ep. Iac. 2. 24.*
(68) *Muſcul. in loc. tit. de iuſtif. p. 504. Schluſſel. Theol. Cal. li. 1. art. 55 fol. 50. Cent. 2. l. 2. c. 4. Col. 54. 71.*

Laſtly this place is ſo vnanſwerable, that ſundry Prot. reiecting this Epiſtle, for Apocryphall, do yield for their reaſon therof, that *Iuſtification by workes is taught therin.* Wherof Luther ſaith, (65) *Iames concludeth naughtily; It followeth not as Iames doteth, therfore fruites iuſtify. Let our Aduerſaries therfore be packing with their Iames.* Melanchton, (66) *But if they cannot be mitigated by any expoſition, as that of Iames, you ſee &c. ſuch ſimply are not to be receiued.* Beza, (67) *This Epiſtle for that Cauſe is altogether reiected by ſome, as though it did impugne ſound doctrine.* And the ſame is taught by other (68) Prot. So that when the Scriptures are ſo plaine, as that by no Expoſition they can be euaded by Prot. then they muſt be caſt away for Apocryphall.

But the Scriptures are ſo plaine & plentifull in behalfe of good workes, that Luther being much vrged therewith, hath inſtructed his Schollers to anſwere them thus,

thus, (69) *Here is Christ, there the Testimonies of Scripture, for the Law and workes: But Christ is Lord of the Scripture &c. thou vrgest the Seruant, that is, the Scripture: I leaue the seruant to thee; I vrge the Lord, who is the king of Scripture.* So making Christ and the Scriptures to be contrary one to another: which is intollerable blasphemy, and an euident signe of a desperate Cause.

(69) Tom. 3. in Gal. fol. 145.

But to proceed, if neither Hope, Charity, nor other vertues, but only Faith doth iustify, then it necessarily followeth, that if true faith were separated from other vertues, the same would truly iustify, wheras it is most certaine that, (70) *He that loueth not, abydeth in death.* And, *If* (71) *I should haue all faith, so that I could remoue mountaines, and haue not Charity, I am nothing.* Because these words, (72) *If I should haue all faith, so that I could remoue mountaines, and haue not Charity, I am nothing*, do proue no faith to be sufficient to Iustification without Charity; Beza heere for πᾶσαν, *omnem*, translateth, *totam*: and this he saith, he did, *lest this should deceiue any man.* Besids it would follow, that a man hauing true faith were truly iust, though he had a full and deliberate intention to blaspheme, murther &c. which is most absurd.

(70) 1. Ioh. 3. 14.

(71) 1. Cor. 13. 2.

(72) 1. Cor. 13. 2.

Now, that a mā may haue true faith without Charity, besides the next recited wordes of S. Paul, is by sundry other texts manifest, as, *Yet* (73) *of the Princes many beleiued in him: but for the Pharisees they did not confesse, that they might not be cast out of the Synagogue, for they loued the glory of men more, then the glory of God. What* (74) *will it profit &c. if a man sayth he hath faith, but hath not workes? shall sayth be able to saue him?* (75) *They which beleiue in God, be carefull to excell in good workes.* All these places speake of true sayth, and not only of an imperfect knowledge of Christ, as some would euade; agreably to which sayth S. Austine. (76) *See how the Euangelist noteth, and reproueth some, which yet be sayth to haue beleiued in him; who if they should profit in this entrance of sayth, they would by profiting ouercome the loue of humane glory.* But if this sayth could profit, and by profiting ouercome the loue of humane glory, certainly it was a true sayth. Agayne sayth the same S. Austine. (77) *Some haue beleiued being Predestinate to life eternall, but some haue not beleiued: But of those who haue beleiued, some did so confesse, that*

(73) Ioh. 12. 42. 43.

(74) Iac. 2. 14.

(75) Tit. 3. 8.

(76) Tract. 53. in Ioan.

(77) Tract. 54. in Ioan.

taking boughes of Palmes they met him coming, reioycing in the ſame Confeſſion of prayſe: But others of the Princes durſt not confeſſe, leſt they ſhould be caſt out of the Synagogue. Heere the ſame Fayth is aſcribed to thoſe which profeſſed Ieſus manifeſtly, and to thoſe who durſt not profeſſe him. Now no man will deny, but that thoſe who did profeſſe him, had true faith in Chriſt, therfore alſo it was true in thoſe that did not confeſſe him: but in the firſt it worked with Charity, in the later it was alone without Charity. Laſtly, he expreſly teacheth that,

(78) *De Trinit. Lib. c. 18.* (78) *Fayth truly may be without Charity, but not to profit.*

This truth is further proued by all ſuch (79) places as ſhew, that in the true Church (in which none can be without true faith) ſome are good, and ſome are euill: And yet the bad are not reprehended for want of *fayth*, but for want of the *mariage garment*, that is, Charity, and for want of *oyle*, which ſignifyeth workes of mercy. And (80) *not euery one that ſayth to me Lord, Lord, ſhall enter into the Kingdome of heauen, but he that doth the will of my father, which is in heauen, he ſhall enter into the Kingdome of heauen.* Theſe men haue Fayth, otherwiſe they could not inuocate *Lord, Lord*; according to that of S. Paul, (81) *How then ſhall they inuocate in whome they haue not beleeued*, and yet beſids this fayth, to enter into Heauen, they muſt do the will of the Father.

(79) *Mat 3. 12. & 13. 48. & 22. 10. & 25. 2.*

(80) *Mat. 7. 21.*

(81) *Rom. 10. 14.*

Laſtly, Prot. do therefore teach Iuſtification by only fayth, becauſe if it depeded conditionally vpon workes, then no man could be aſſured of his Iuſtification, in which aſſurance or certainty they place their Iuſtification, and ſo their ſayd Iuſtification ſhould be impoſſible. But if fayth be neceſſarily ioyned with workes, then, in that our Iuſtification dependeth of fayth, it dependeth alſo at leaſt for our knowledge thereof, of good workes, and ſo thereby none can be aſſured, that he is iuſtifyed, directly againſt Proteſtants.

SECT.

SECT. III.

The Fathers expound the Sacred Scriptures in proofe of Iuſtification not only by fayth, but likewiſe by workes: Alſo that true fayth may be without workes.

IN cleereſt proofe heereof S. Auſtine writeth thus, (1) *Wherefore now let vs ſee that which is to be caſt from Religious harts, leſt by euill ſecurity they looſe their Salvation, if for the obtayning therof, they ſhall thinke only faith to ſuffice, and ſhall neglect to liue well and by good workes to keep the wayes of God. For euen in the tymes of the Apoſtles, certaine hard ſentences of Paul the Apoſtle not being vnderſtood, ſome thought that he ſaid this, Let vs do euill that good may come, becauſe he had ſaid, (2) The law entred in, that ſinne might abound. And where ſinne abounded, grace did more abound &c. When then the Apoſtle ſaith, that he accounteth a man to be iuſtifyed by faith without workes of the law, he doth not this, that faith being obtained and profeſſed, the workes of Iuſtice ſhould be contemned, but that euery one may know, that he may be iuſtifyed by faith, although the workes of the law be not precedent. For they follow him that is iuſtifyed, do not go before him that is to be iuſtifyed &c. Therfore becauſe this opinion was then begunne, the other Apoſtolicall Epiſtles of Peter, Iohn, Iames, Iude, do chiefly direct their intention againſt it, that they may ſtrongly confirme, that Faith without workes doth profit nothing: Euen alſo, as Paul himſelfe hath not defyned any fayth whatſoeuer whereby God is beleeued, but that wholſome and plainly Euangelicall, whoſe workes proceed of loue; (3) Faith, ſaith he, which worketh by Charity. Wherupon that faith which ſeemeth to ſome to ſuffice to Salvation, he ſo affirmeth to profit nothing, that he ſaith, (4) if I ſhould haue all faith, that I could remoue mountaines, and haue not Charity, I am nothing. And, (5) I ſee not why Chriſt ſhould ſay, if thou wilt haue lyfe euerlaſting, keep the Commandements, if without obſeruing of them by only faith, a man might be ſaued.*

(1) *De fide & oper. c 14.*

(2) *Rom. 5. 20.*

(1) *Gal. 5. 6.*

(4) *1. Cor. 13. 2.*

(5) *De fide & oper. c. 15.*

S. Ambroſe demaundeth, (6) *What Saluation can be to vs, vnleſs we waſh away our ſinnes by faſting, ſeeing the Scripture ſaith, (7) Faſting, and almes do free from ſinne. Who then are theſe new*

(6) *L. 10. Ep. 82.*

(7) *Tob. 4. & 12.*

maisters, who exclude the merit of falling? Origen affirmeth that, (8) *Those who professe faith in Iesus, but do not prepare themselues with good workes to saluation, are to be compared to the foolish Virgins.* Wherof also saith S. Cyrill, (9) *Do not trust in this, that thou hast the lampe only, but keep it burning. Do not trust in this only, that thou beleuest, but keep faith burning, that thy light may shine before men by good workes &c.*

(8) Tract. 32. in Mat.

(9) Catech. 15.

S. Chrysostome demaundeth, (10) *Is it sufficient for life eternall to beleiue in the Sonne?* And his answere is, *No, For not euery one, (11) saith he, who saith to me Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdome of heauen &c. If thou shalt rightly beleiue in the Father, and the Sonne, and the holy Ghost, but shalt not rightly liue, it doth nothing profit thee to Saluation.* To the same effect saith Cyrill of Alexandria, (12) *That faith doth not suffice to Saluation, the Disciple of Christ sheweth, writing. (13) Thou beleuest there is one God, the Deuils also beleeue and tremble. If therfore only faith should be sufficient, the multitude of Deuils could not perish: wherfore the workes of Charity must come to faith.*

(10) Ho. 30. in Ioan.

(11) Mat. 7.

(12) L. 10. in Io c. 18.

(13) Iac. 2. 19.

The Fathers did so confessedly teach Iustification by workes, that Melancthon saith, (14) *Origen, and many others following him, faigned men to be iust for their workes.* Whitaker chargeth with (15) *Errour herin not only Cyprian, but almost all the most holy Fathers of that tyme.* The Centurists say of those ancient times, (16) *It seemeth, that for the most part this chiefest Article of Iustification to haue bene obscured, for they attributed to workes Iustice euen before God.* (17) *Origen made good workes the Cause of Iustification.* Luther termeth (18) *Hierome, Ambrose, Austine and others, Iustice-workers of the old Papacy.* Bullinger acknowledgeth that, (19) *The Doctrine of Merits, Satisfaction, and Iustification of workes, did wonderfully after the Apostles tymes lay their first foundations.* So confessedly did the ancientest and learnedst Fathers teach our Catholicke Doctrine of Iustification by workes.

(14) In Ep. ad Rom. p. 191.

(15) Resp. ad Rat. Camp. p 78. Fulk. in Def. of the Engl. Transl. p. 368.

(16) Cent. 3. c. 4. Col 79.

(17) Cent. 1. Col. 265. 266.

(18) In Gal. c. 4.

(19) Vpon the Apoc. Serm. 87.

SECT.

SECT. IV.

That ſundry Prot. do teach our Doctrine of Iuſtification by Workes, and not only by Fayth.

IT is ſuppoſed, that Huſſe, Wicliffe, and other pretended Prot. before Luthers tyme agreed with Catholickes heerin, as well for that we do not find that they were charged, or troubled for any contrary doctrine, but alſo for that Foxe auoucheth that, (1) *Our free Iuſtification by fayth only, was long hid before Luthers tyme, and opened by him.* And ſo Melanchthon cenſured (2) *Wicliffe*, that, *He did not at all vnderſtand, nor hould the Iuſtice of fayth.*

(1) *Act. Mon. p. 402.*

(2) *Ep. ad Frider. Micon.*

M. Napier vpon theſe wordes of the Apocalypſe, (3) *The dead were iudged &c. according to their workes*, writeth thus, (4) *By workes heere are we iudged and iuſtifyed, and not by fayth only, as alſo Iames 2. 24. teſtifyeth, meaning heerby, that of liuely fayth and of the good workes that follow thereupon, man is iuſtifyed, and not of that dead fayth, that is by it ſelfe alone without any good workes.* And then reconcyling the ſeeming repugnance betweene S. Paul and S. Iames, he affirmeth that S. Paul ſaith, *We are iuſtifyed by fayth without the workes of the law, that is to ſay, not without good workes whatſoeuer &c. although it be without the precyſe workes that the Law requireth &c.* Yea ſhall fynd both *Iames and Paul agree in diuers places, that fayth without workes is a dead fayth, and ſerueth nothing to Iuſtification.* Yea he ſpareth not to ſay, *we are iuſtified by faythfull workes &c.*

(3) *Apoc. 20. 12.*

(4) *In Apoc. c. 20. p. 296. 297.*

Caluin affirmeth, (5) *Iuſtification not to ſtand without workes, and that good workes are not only acceptable to God, but alſo are to haue reward. And good workes of the faythfull are cauſes why our Lord doth beſtow his benefits vpon them.* Finally that, *our Lord doth imbrace workes as the inferiour Cauſes of our Saluation.* Rogers confeſſeth that, (6) *Iuſtification by fayth only, is grounded vpon Gods written word, though not by our common and vulgar termes to be read therein:* which is in playne termes, to acknowledge, that Iuſtification by fayth only, is not to be read in Gods word.

(5) *Inſtit. l. 3. c. 17. §. 8.*

(6) *Def. of the Art. art. 20 p. 110.*

Peter

Peter Martyr expounding the foreſayd wordes of Daniel, *Redeeme thy Sinnes with Almes*, confeſſeth that, (7) *This ſeemeth to be the moſt playne ſenſe of all; If thou wilt heare me, thou ſhalt conſider how thou mayeſt purge thy Sinnes, and mayſt returne into fauour with God: this may be done, if thou ſhalt redeeme thy ſinnes by Iuſtice, and Beneficence.*

(7) Hom. 21. in Dan.

SECT. V.

Obiections taken from Scripture in proofe of Iuſtification by only Fayth, and not by Workes, anſwered.

IT is obiected from S. Paul that, (1) *If Abraham were iuſtifyed by workes, he hath glory, but not with God.* And, (2) *We account a man to be iuſtifyed by fayth without the workes of the law.* Anſw. Luther to make this later place the ſtronger, addeth thus to the text, *we account a man to be iuſtifyed by only Fayth:* And in defence heerof he ſayth to a friend of his, (3) *If thy Papiſt ſhew himſelfe angry and diſcontented for the word* (ſola) *forthwith tell him, A Papiſt, and an Aſſe are the ſame thing.* Agayne, *I knew long ſince, that in this place neyther in the Greeke nor the Latin text the word* (ſola) *was read, neyther was there any need that the Papiſtes ſhould admonish me thereof &c. I repent me that I added not* (omnes) *and* (omnibus) *that ſo it ſhould be without all workes of all lawes, and ſo I had ſpoken well and roundly. Wherefore this word ſhall remayne in my Teſtament, although all Bishops ſhould runne mad togeather, and ſhould be transformed into aſſes, yet they ſhall not shaue it thence from me.* But to omit this curſed adding to the Scirptures, and Luthers ſcurrill impudency, the Gentils did boaſt of their Philoſophy & morall vertues proceeding of nature: and the Iewes did lykewiſe boaſt of their law & legall Obſeruations, both which the Apoſtle confuteth in that Epiſtle, and proueth that neyther of theſe are of any force to Saluation, without the Grace of Chriſt and fayth in him; to that end in the later place expreſſely naming and excluding the Workes of the Law, that is, fayth Iohn Huſſe, (4) *The legall Ceremonies*: and in the firſt, explayning himſelfe, ſaying there next before, (5) *What did Abraham find*

(1) Rom. 4. 2.
(2) Rom. 3. 28.
(3) Ep. ad Amicum. de voce (ſola) quam Rom. 3 de ſuo adiecit. See tom. 5. Germ. Ien fol 141. & tom. 4. Ger. Wit. fol. 475.
(4) In Ep. Loc 12.
(5) Rom. 4.

out

our Father according to the flesh? Agreably herto answereth ancient Sedulius, (6) *Without what works of the law is the Apostle to be thought to affirme man to be iustified by faith? to wit of Circumcision, and the Sabboth, and other such like, not without the workes of Iustice, of which S. Iames sayth, Fayth without workes is dead.*

(6) *Ad c. 3. ad Rom.*

Lastly, this is answered by S. (7) Austine saying: *Men not vnderstanding that which the Apostle saith (we count a man to be iustified by faith without the workes of the Law) did thinke that he said, faith would suffice a man though he liued ill, and had no good workes. Which God forbid that the Vessell of Election should thinke: who in a certaine place after he had said, In Christ Iesus neither Circumcision nor Prepuce auayleth any whit, he straight added, but faith which worketh by loue.*

(7) *De Gra. & lib. Arb. c. 7.*

And wheras some oppose S. Paul to S. Iames, S. Austine thus Catholickly reconcileth them, (8) *Wherfore the sentences of the 2. Apostles Paul and Iames, are not contrary in themselues: when one saith, a man is iustified by faith without workes, and another saith, Faith is void without workes: because he, speaketh of workes that go before faith, this, of those which follow faith, euen as Paul himselfe sheweth in many places. Heerof* saith D. Whitaker, (9) *Austine reconcileth Iames to Paul, wherfore, saith Austine, the Sentences of the two Apostles, Paul and Iames, are not contrary in themselues &c. because Paul speaketh of workes which go before faith* (vnto which neuer any Catholicke ascribed Iustification) *and Iames of those workes that follow faith:* which is the same truth that Catholicks now teach.

(8) *L. 83. Quæstionum q. 72. fin. & l. de fide & operibus c. 14. init.*

(9) *Resp. ad Camp. rat. 2 p. 12. See Cens. 5 c. 10. Col. 1233.*

Others obiect that, (10) *As many as receiued him, he gaue them power to be made the Sonnes of God, to those that believe in him.* And, (11) *So must the Sonne of Man be exalted, that euery one which believeth in him perish not, but may haue life euerlasting.* Answ. Wheras many causes concurre to the producing of one effect, as our Iustification, sometimes the Scriptures attribute the same effect to one Cause, sometimes to another; yet neuer so as excluding the rest. And so, as in these places it referreth our Iustification and saluation to *Faith*, so in other, it referreth to (12) *Charity*, (13) *Hope*, (14) *Baptisme*, & other vertues. And agreably vnto this saith S. Clement, (15) *Wherfore when we shall heare, Thy faith hath saued thee, we do not vnderstand him*

(10) *Io. 1. 12.*

(11) *Io. 3. 14.*

(12) *Luc. 7. 47. 1. Io. 3. 14. 1. Pet. 4. 8.*

(13) *Rom. 8. 24.*

(14) *Tit. 3. 5.*

(15) *L. 4. Strom. post med.*

him to ſay abſolutly thoſe to be ſaued, who any waies believe, vnles their
(16) *Mar.* 16. 16. *deeds ſhall follow:* And ſo where it is ſaid in S. Marke. (16) *He*
(17) *Mat.* 28. 20. *that believeth and is baptized, ſhalbe ſaued*, S. Mathew alſo addeth theſe wordes of our Sauiour, (17) *teaching them to obſerue all things whatſoeuer I haue commanded you*, which contayneth all good workes, and the whole Iuſtice of a Chriſtian man.

(18) *Rom.* 3. 24. (19) *Rom.* 11. 6. Such places alſo are vrged, wherin our Iuſtification is ſaid to be *gratis*. (18) *Iuſtifyed gratis by his grace:* (19) *If by grace, not now of works, otherwiſe Grace is not Grace.* Anſw. The word, *Gratis*, is either taken, as it is oppoſed to debt of Iuſtice, and true merit *de condigno*, & this hindreth not, but that as faith, ſo likewiſe good workes may concurre *gratis* to our Iuſtification, as diſpoſitions, and as meritorious *de congruo:* or els it is taken as it is oppoſed to workes done without grace, only by the force of nature; but this excludeth not abſolutely all merit, but only our owne merit, that is, ſuch as is from our ſelues, and not from God: ſo that Iuſtification *gratis*, is not all one with Iuſtification by only Faith: neither doth it exclude ſuch workes as proceede from Grace, for ſo it alſo ſhould exclude faith, which proceedeth from Grace,
(20) *Io.* 6. 29. and which alſo is a moſt excellent worke it ſelfe. (20) *This is the worke of God that you believe in him &c.* but it only excludeth ſuch workes, as are done only by the ſtrength of nature, & ſuch as ſhould merit our Iuſtification *de condigno*, Iuſtice, and debt.

(21) *Luc.* 8. 50. Some obiect thoſe words of our Sauiour, (21) *Believe only, and she shalbe ſafe.* Heere ſome thinke they haue found only faith to ſaue: But heere Chriſt ſpeaketh not of Iuſtification and remiſſion of ſinnes, but of the miraculous rayſing of one from death to lyfe. Now for the working of miracles fayth alone doth ſometymes ſuffice, as might be eaſily proued from Mat. 7. 22.

Now that true fayth cannot be without good workes,
(22) *1. Tim.* 5. 8. ſome obiect that of (22) S. Paul, *But if any man haue not care of his owne, and eſpecially of his Domeſticalls, he hath denyed the faith, and is worſe then an Infidell.* Anſw. S. Chriſoſtome and others do expound this of thoſe who are ſayd to deny their fayth, becauſe they do not liue as their fayth teacheth them, who,

as

as the ſame Apoſtle ſayth, (23) *Confeſs they know God, but in deeds deny him.* Who are ſaid in this reſpect of want of Charity towards their owne, to be worſe then Infidels, who haue a care of their owne; and ſo deny their fayth not in hart or mouth, but in deeds. (23) Tit. 1. 16.

Others vrge thoſe wordes of S. Iohn, (24) *He that ſayth he knoweth him and keepeth not his Commãdements is a lyar.* Anſw. *Knowledge* heere is taken, according to S. Bedes and Oecumenius Expoſition, for the knowledge of loue and friendſhip, in which ſenſe Chriſt ſayth to the wicked, (25) *I know you not:* wherefore if any man vaunt himſelfe to know God by familiar and experimentall knowledge of his Graces, and yet keepeth not his Commandements, this man is a lyar. And therefore ſuch are all moderne heretickes, who profeſſe themſelues to be in the fauour of God, by onely fayth, and yet they acknowledge they neyther keep, nor poſſibly can keep his Commandements. Some obiect that, (26) *Whoſoeuer beleeueth that Ieſus is Chriſt, is borne of God*, and therfore doubtles hath Charity. Anſw. (27) S. Auſtine teacheth that this is ſpoken of fayth informed, which worketh by Charity. (24) 1. Io. 2. 4. (25) Mat. 25. 12. (26) 1. Io. 5. 1. (27) Tract. 10. in Ep. Ioan.

CHAP. XXXVII.

The true State of the Queſtion, concerning merit of Workes.

Whether Workes proceeding from Faith and Charity, do truly merit increaſe of Grace and Glory.

SECT. I.

Catholike Doctrine.

HAVING proued that good workes do iuſtify, it remayneth now to ſhew that they are truly meritorious of Grace and eternall Glory. To which purpoſe the Catholicke Church decreeth that, (1) *Seeing Chriſt Ieſus doth continually powre vertue into thoſe that are iuſtifyed, as the head into the members, and the vyne into the branches: which vertue doth alwaies precede & accompany, and follow their good workes, and without which they can by no meanes be gratefull to God and meritorious; nothing more is to be thought to be wanting to the iuſtifyed, but that by thoſe workes which are done in God, they may be iudged to haue fully ſatisfyed Gods Law, for the ſtate of this lyfe, and to haue truly deſerued lyfe eternall to be gained in its tyme, if that they ſhall depart in Grace, &c.* neither is that to be omitted, that although ſo much be aſcribed to good workes in the ſacred Scriptures, that

(1) Conc. Trid. Seſſ. 6. cap. 16.

to him who shall giue to one of his least ones a draught of could water, Christ promiseth he shall not want his reward &c. Yet God forbid, that a Christian should either trust or glory in himselfe, and not in our Lord, whose goodnes is so great towards all men, as that those things which are his guiftes, he will haue to be their merits. And because all offend in many things, as euery one ought to haue before his eyes mercy and goodnes, so also seuerity and iudgment: neither let any man iudge himselfe, although he be guilty of nothing to himselfe; because the lyfe of men is not to be examined and iudged by mans iudgment, but Gods, who will enlighten the hidden things of darknes, and will manifest the Counsailes of the hartes. And then praise shalbe to euery one from God, who, as it is written, will giue to euery one according to his workes. Wherfore, (2) If any shall affirme, a iust mans good workes so to be the guiftes of God, that they are not also the good merites of him that is iustifyed: or that he who is iustifyed by good workes, which are done by him through the Grace of God, and the merit of Iesus Christ, whose lively member he is, doth not truly merit increase of Grace, life eternall, and the obtaining of lyfe eternall, if so he dye in Grace, as also the increase of glory, Anathema.

(2) *Sess. 6. Can. 32.*

In the Councell of Moguntia it is defined, that, (3) *Those workes which the iustifyed do &c. to be truly good and gratefull to God, and worthy the reward of eternall lyfe.* And so all Catholikes teach, that workes proceeding from Gods Grace, through the merits of Christ, are truly and properly meritorious of Grace and eternall Glory.

(3) *Cap. 8. See Conc. Senon. Decret. 16.*

Points Disputable.

(4) *Dillar. de Iustif. l. 5 c. 1. 2. & 5. Rhem. Test. in Rom. 2. 6.*

All believing that workes proceeding from Grace do truly merit: some (5) teach, that the reward giuen to such workes is according to the forme of communicative Iustice. But (6) others more probably teach, that it is according to the forme of distributiue Iustice.

(5) *Durand. 2. Dist. 27. q. 2.*

(6) *Cajet. 1. p. q. 21. art. 1.*

Some (7) teach that the naturall motions of the mind do merit *ex congruo*, the first grace. (8) Others ascribe this only to the supernaturall motions of perfect faith, Charity &c. Whereby we are sufficiently disposed to grace, confiding them, not as they proceeded from Grace, but from free will.

(7) *Durand. 2. Dist. 28. q. 5. Gabr. 2. Dist. 28 q. vnica.*

(8) *Vega q. 7. de Iustif.*

(9) Others more probably deny merit *ex congruo*, to all actes disposing to Grace.

(9) *Valent. Tom. 2. Disp. 2. q. 6. p. 4. §. 2.*

Some (10) thinke, that the good workes of the iust do merit *ex condigno* lyfe eternall, by reason of the worke, although there were no pact or promise from God. (11) Others thinke that they only so merit by reason of the pact & Gods acceptation. But (12) others most probably teach, that they are so meritorious by reason of the pact, and the worke also.

(10) *Caiet. in. 1. 2. q. 114. art. 3. Scotus l. 3. de Nat. & Grat. c. 7.*

(11) *Scotus 1. Dist. 17. q. 2. Vega de Iustificat. q. 5.*

(12) *S. Tho. 1. 2. q. 114. art. 3. S. Bonauent. in 2. Dist. 27.*

Protestants Vntruthes.

Melanchon (13) affirmeth, that Catholikes believe that, *by good workes done out of the state of Grace they merit grace by Gods couenant*, that, *by attrition they merit grace*: that, *for the blotting out of sinne only detestation of the crime sufficeth*: That, *by Contrition, not by fayth in Christ we may obtayne remission of sinnes &c.* Againe, (14) *Our aduersaries are plainly deafe it hath beene so often sayd, the law not to profit without Christ, for whome good workes pleased. But they euery where, Christ excluded, do teach the workes of the law to merit Iustification.* But these are all so grosse, that I persuade my selfe inſteed of further answere, that no man will believe him.

(13) *In Apol. art. 12.*

(14) *In Apol. p. 122.*

Accordingly Rogers sayth, (15) *Sinnes mortall, not by the merits of Christ only, but many wayes besides are cleansed, thinke the Papists, as by the merits of dead Saintes, namely of S. Mary the Virgin.* And, (16) *Supererogatory workes do merit* (say they) *remission of sinnes, and that not for the doers of them only but for others besids.* But the Rhemistes whome he cyteth for this, haue not the word *merit*, but only *satisfy*: teaching as all other Catholickes do, the good workes of one, though they cannot merit for another, yet they may iustly satisfy for him.

(15) *Def. of the Art. art. 11. p. 52.*

(16) *Ib. Art. 24. p. 68.*

Protestant Doctrine.

The Doctrine of merit of workes is so displeasing to Prot. as that (17) Caluin much disliketh the word *Merit*, or *Reward*, reprouing the ancient Fathers for vsing the same: And

(17) *Instit. l. 3. c. 15. §. 2.*

And further ſaying (18) *We take from men the opinion of merit-ing.* According to M. Perkins, (19) *Man cannot merit a morſell of bread.* Scharpius, (20) *We ſay, that the workes of the faythfull in the ſight of God are no wayes meritorious, neyther of congruity, nor condignity.*

(18) *Ibid. c.16. §. 2.*
(19) *Reform. Cath. Contro. 3. c.1.*
(20) *De Iuſt. Controu. 13. p.128.*

Proteſtants agree with Ancient Hereticks.

We condemne (ſayth S. (21) Auſtine) *the Errour of Iouinian, who ſayd there was no difference of merits in the world to come.* And S. (22) Ambroſe with others terme it *a rude bowling &c. to confound all things promiſcuouſly &c. and to take away the degrees of different merits.*

(21) *De temp. Ser. 191.*
(22) *Conc. Teluſe & Reſcriptum Ambroſij & aliorum ad Siricium. Pap. ib.*

Proteſtant Errours.

Luther teacheth that (23) *good workes do not make a man good, nor euill workes euill.* And, (24) *Thou ſeeſt how rich a Chriſtian or baptized man is, that although he would, he cannot looſe his Saluation by any ſinnes how great ſoeuer, vnles he will not beleeue; for no ſinnes can damne, but only Infidelity.*

(23) *L. de libert. Chriſt.*
(24) *L. de Captiu. Babyl. c. de Bap.*

Many (25) Prot. teach that Chriſt is our Mediatour according to both natures, diuine and humane. Yea Swinglius teacheth that, (26) *Chriſt is to vs a Sauiour by that part wherein he deſcended from heauen, not by that he was borne of the moſt vnſpotted Virgin.* And further addeth (27) elſwhere, *that the fleſh of Chriſt profiteth nothing, it profiteth nothing at all.*

(25) *Calum in Epiſt. duabus ad Polones. Chem. l. de duabus naturis. Melanct. in loc. cap. de filio. & in l. concor. p.538. 641. 730.*
(26) *L. de vera & fal. Relig. c. de Euchar.*
(27) *Tom. 4. in c. 6 Ioan. p.310.*

Calum affirmeth that, (28) *to aske whether Chriſt merited to himſelfe (which the Schoolmen do) is no leſſe fooliſh curioſity, then temerarious definition, where they affirme the ſame &c. by what merits could man obtayne that he ſhould be the Iudge of the world, the head of Angels?* And the ſame is taught by (29) Danæus, and Paræus.

(28) *Inſtit. l. 2. c. 17. §. 8.*
(29) *Controu. 2. p. 107. Paraus de Iuſtif. 5. c. 3.*

Tyndall thinketh that, (30) *For as much as concerneth pleaſing of God, no worke is better then another. To make water, to waſh diſhes, to be a Schoomaker, or Apoſtle, is all alike.* And this doctrine Foxe himſelfe thinketh to be *free from hereſy.* Luther, *If I ſhould ſee heauen open, and that I could merit it by taking a ſtraw from*

(30) *Foxe his Act. & Mon. edit. 1570. p. 1238.* (31) *Apud Scioppium in Eccleſiaſtico, c. 67.*

from the ground, I would not take vp the straw. So poore esteeme haue Prot. of all merits of good workes.

SECT. II.

It is proued by Scriptures that workes proceeding from Faith and Charity, do truly merit increase of Grace and Glory.

TO decyde this by Scripture, such texts proue our Catholike Doctrine as teach lyfe eternall to be called (1) μισθὸς, *merces, wages, hyre, or reward.* (1) *Reioyce for your reward is very great in heauen.* (2) *Call the workemen, and pay them their hyre.* That by reward and hyre in these places is vnderstood lyfe eternall, it is so manifest, that I thinke none will deny it: And that this reward is due not only in regard of Gods promise, but also in regard of the workes, these words couince: *Call the workemen & pay them their hyre:* Neyther can any without great abuse in speach entitle with the name of wages, hyre or reward, a guift of a King promised vpon meere liberality without all respect of desert and worke in the receyuer.

(1) Mat. 5. 12.
(2) Mat. 20. 8.

If the reward of heauen be giuen according to the measure and proportion of our workes and labours, then in the bestowing of that reward, respect is not had only of the promise and bounty of God, but also of the dignity and desert of the workes. (3) *The Sonne of Man shall come in the glory of his father with his Angels: and then will he render to euery man according to his workes.* (4) *With the same measure that you do meat, it shall be measured to you againe.* (5) *He that soweth sparingly, sparingly also shall reape, and he that soweth in blessings, of blessings also shall reape.* (6) *Euery one shall receyue his owne reward according to his owne labour.* (7) *Many sinnes are forgiuen her because, she hath loued much: but to whome lesse is forgiuen, he loueth lesse.* These and sundry other such places conuince that the greatnes or smalnes of our reward, is proportionable to the greatnes or smalnes of the dignity and worth of our workes: which conuinceth the workes to be meritorious.

(1) Mat. 16. 27. Rom. 2. 6. Apoc. 22. 12.
(4) Luc. 6. 38.
(5) 2. Cor. 9. 6.
(6) 1 Cor. 3. 8.
(7) Luc. 7. 47.

God

Good workes are further ſayd to be the cauſe, why life Eternall is giuen vs. (8) *Come yee bleſſed of my father, poſſeſſe you the Kingdome &c. for I was hungry, and you gaue me to eate &c. Becauſe thou haſt beene faythfull ouer a few things, I will place thee ouer many things; enter into the ioy of thy Lord.* (10) *Theſe are they which are come out of great tribulation, and haue waſhed their robes and made them whyte in the blood of the Lambe, therefore they are before the throne of God &c.* (11) *Our tribulation which preſently is momentane and light, worketh aboue meaſure exceedingly an eternall wayght of glory in vs.*

(8) *Mat.* 25. 34.
(9) *Mat.* 25. 23.
(10) *Apoc.* 7. 14. 15. *ſect.* 1. 10 3. 11.
(11) 2. *Cor.* 4. 17.

For the auoyding of this place, (12) Fulke and other Engliſh Tranſlatours of the Byble, do inſteed of *worketh*, tranſlate, *prepareth*, whereas the Greeke Word, κατεργάζεται, ſignifyeth *worketh*, and ſome (13) Engliſh Bybles tranſlate, *cauſeth*; yea Fulke himſelfe confeſſeth that, (14) *That tranſlation of preparing, is not ſo proper.*

(12) *Ag. Rhem. Teſt.* 2. *Cor.* 4. 17.
(13) Of 1576.
(14) In defence of the Engl. Tranſlation. p. 273.

The reward of good workes is ſayd to be giuen of Iuſtice. (15) *There is layd vp for me a Crown of Iuſtice, which our Lord will render to me, in that day, a iuſt Iudge: and not only to me, but to thē alſo that loue his coming.* (16) *Our ſelues glory in you &c. for your patience and fayth in all your perſecutions &c. for an example of the iuſt Iudgement of God, that you may be counted worthy of the Kingdome of God &c. If yee be iuſt with God to repay tribulation to them that vexe you, and to you that are vexed reſt with vs in the reuelation of our Lord Ieſus from heauen with the Angels &c.* (17) *God is not vniuſt to forget our workes* And hence it is, that our good workes are called (18) δικαιώματα, Iuſtifications.

(15) 2. *Tim.* 4. 8.
(16) 2. *Theſ.* 1. 4. 5. 6.
(17) *Heb.* 6. 10.
(18) *Luc.* 1. 6. *Apoc.* 19. 8.

A promiſe made vpon Condition of ſome worke, the worke being performed, is of Iuſtice to be kept, and the worker truly deſerueth it: but life Eternall is promiſed to good workes. (19) *Bleſſed is the man that ſuffereth tentation for when he hath beene proued, he ſhall receiue the Crowne of life, which God hath promiſed to them that loue him.* (20) *Piety is profitable to all things, hauing promiſe of the life that now is, and of that to come.* (21) *Euery one that hath left houſe or brethren &c. for my ſake, ſhall receyue an hundred fould, and ſhall poſſeſſe life euerlaſting.*

(19) *Iac.* 1. 12.
(20) 1. *Tim.* 4. 8.
(21) *Mat.* 19. 29.
(22) *Luc.* 10. 7.

To be worthy, to merit or deſerue, ſignify all one thing. Chriſt ſayth, (22) *The workeman is worthy of his hyre.*

(23) *That*

That you may walke worthy of God, in all things pleasing, fruitifying in all good workes. (24) That you may be counted worthy of the Kingdome of God; for the which also you suffer. (25) They shall walke with me in whytes, because they are worthy. And, (26) God proued them and found them worthy of him. Now whereas Prot. for *Worthy*, translate, *Meete*, it is so vnworthily done, that Fulke himselfe sayth, (27) *For my part I wish they had retayned the vsuall signification of that word, and sayd, worthy of himselfe*, God being a iust Iudge, & not accepter of persons, doth thereupon giue to euery one according to his merits. (28) *There is no acception of persons with God.* (29) *If you inuocate the Father, him which without the acception of persons, iudgeth according to euery ones worke.*

(24) 2. Thess. 1.5. See Luc. 20.35. & 21. 36.
(25) Ap 3.4.
(26) Sap. 3.5
(27) Defence of the Engl. Transl. p. 276.
(28) Rom. 2. 11. Gal. 2.6.
(29) 1. Pet. 1. 17. Act. 10. 35.

But the Scriptures are so vnanswerable and conuincing in behalfe of good workes, that Luther for want of other answere doth fly to his desperate and damnable refuge, saying, (30) *Although the Papists do bring a great heape of Scriptures, in which good workes are commanded, yet I nothing care for all the words of Scripture, although more then those were yet produced. Thou Papist dost greatly contemne, and with the Scripture makest thy selfe courageous; which yet is inferiour to Christ, as Lord. Therefore I am nothing moued therewith. Go too then, rely vpon the seruant as much as thou wilt, but I do rely vpon Christ the true maister, Lord and Emperour of Scripture. To him I do assent, and know that he will lye to me in nothing, nor will lead me into Errour. I do rather make choyce to honour and beleiue him, then that, with all the sayings of Scripture, I will suffer my selfe to be remoued from my opinion a nayles breadth.* So conuincing then are the Scriptures, for the merits of workes, as Prot. are inforced to disclayme from the Scriptures, and to appeale only to Christ himselfe, as though the doctrine of Christ and the Scriptures were contrary.

(30) Colloq. Iisl. de Christo. fol. 98. tom. 1. Ger. Wit. part 2. fol. 190 tom. 5 lat. fo. 500. in Colloq. de Sanct. fol. 125. de tentationibus fidei fol. 188. tom. 6. Ger. lat. fol. 82. tom. 7. Ger. Wit. fol. 483.

SECT.

SECT. III.

The Fathers do expound the Scriptures in proofe of Merit of Workes.

S. Ambroſe demaundeth, (1) *What ſalvation can be to vs, vnleſs we waſh our ſinnes away by Faſting*, ſeeing the Scripture ſaith, (2) *Faſting and almes do free from ſinne: who are therfore theſe new Maiſters, who exclude the merit of faſting?* And vpon thoſe wordes of the Pſalmiſt, *Be mindfull of thy word*, he further ſaith, (3) *God wilbe agreed with, that if any following the rewards propounded to vertues, ſhall ſtriue well, he may expect ſuite of reward, yea he may exact it.*

(1) L. 10. Ep. 82.
(2) Tob. 4. & 12.
(3) Ser. in Pſ. 118.

Tertullian asketh, (4) *How there are many Manſions with the Father, if it be not for the diuerſity of merits? And how ſhall a* (5) *Star differ from a Star in glory, vnleſs it be for the diuerſity of beames?*

(4) In Scorp. c. 6.
(5) 1. Cor. 15. 42.

Clemens Alex. writeth that, (6) *There are with our Lord many rewards and Manſions by proportion of their liues. For who,* (7) *ſaith he, receiueth a Prophet in the name of a Prophet, ſhall receiue the reward of a Prophet. And he that receiueth a iuſt man in the name of a iuſt man, ſhall receiue the reward of a iuſt man; and who ſhall receiue one of theſe little Diſciples, ſhall not looſe his reward.*

(6) L. 4. Strom.
(7) Mat. 10. 41.

Let vs returne (ſaith S. Auſtine) (8) *to Paul the Apoſtle, whom we fynd without any good deſerts, yea with many euill deſerts to haue obtained the Grace of God, giuing good for euill. Let vs ſee what he ſaith now, his Paſſion drawing neere, writing to Timothie:* (9) *For I am euen now to be ſacrificed, and the tyme of my reſolution is at hand. I haue fought a good fight, I haue conſummate my Courſe, I haue kept the faith. Theſe his good merites he now rehearſeth, that after good merits he may obtayne the Crowne, who after euill merites obtayned Grace. Finally attend what followeth: Concerning the reſt, ſaith he, there is layd vp for me a Crowne of Iuſtice, which our Lord will render to me in that day, a iuſt Iudge. To whom would the Iuſt Iudge giue a Crowne, if the mercifull Father had not giuen Grace? and how had that bene a Crowne of Iuſtice, if grace had not gone before, which iuſtifyeth the wicked? How ſhould it haue bene giuen as*

(8) De Grat. & lib. Arb. c. 6. & ho. 284. ex 50. & in Pſ. 83. & in Pſ. 100.
(9) 2. Tim. 4. 6.

due, if it had not formerly bene giuen gratis? And againe, (10) *Although one be ſtronger then another, one wyſer then another, one more iuſt then another, one more holy then another in my Fathers houſe there are many manſions. None of them ſhalbe eſtranged from that houſe, where euery one is to receiue a Manſion according to his merit.* (11) *That penny truly is equall to all which the Maiſter of the family commandeth to be giuen to all them who wrought in the vineyard, not in that making difference who had laboured leſſe and who more: by which penny lyfe eternall is ſignifyed, where no man liueth longer then another, becauſe in eternity there is no different meaſure of liuing: but many Manſions do ſignify the diuers dignities of merits in one lyfe eternall: for one is the glory of the Sunne, another of the Moone, another of the Starrs, for Star differeth from Star in glory, ſo alſo is the reſurrection of the dead. As Starrs the Saintes obtaine in the kingdome diuers Manſions, diuers excellencies as it were in the heauens.* Yea ſaith he, (12) *We condemne the Errour of Iouinian, who ſaith there is no difference of merits in the world to come.* Of this ſay the Centuriites, (13) *It appeareth, that Auſtine was of that opinion, that Virgins dedicated to holines, haue more merit with God then the faithfull that are maried: for becauſe Iouinian thought the contrary, that they had no more merit, this in him reprehendeth Auſtine.*

(10) Tract. 67. in Ioan.

(11) Mat. 20. 9. 10.

(11) Ser. 192. de Tempore.

(12) cent. 5. c. 4. Col. 518. See Chemnit. Ex. part. p. 4. 110. 142. and Wilſon in defence of Perkins. p. 500.

(13) L. 4. Mor. c. 32.

S. Gregory in proote of merits argueth thus; (14) *Becauſe in this lyfe there is difference of workes, there ſhall no doubt in the other, be difference of honours, that by how much here one excelleth another in merite, there one ſhall exceed another in reward. Whereupon in the Goſpell the Truth ſaith,* (15) *In the houſe of my Father there are many Manſions. But in thoſe ſame Manſions, there ſhall be in ſome reſpect an agreeing diuerſity of rewards: becauſe ſuch force of loue doth ioyne vs in that peace, that what any one receiueth not in himſelfe, he reioyceth to haue receiued in another.*

(14) L. 4. Mor. c. 32.

(15) Io. 14. 2.

S. Irenæus (16) produceth Salomon ſaying, (17) *He lendeth our Lord that hath mercy on the poore. For God who needeth no man, taketh vnto himſelfe our good workes to this end, that he may beſtow vpon vs the retribution of his goods. Euen as our Lord ſaid,* (18) *Come ye bleſſed of my Father, receiue the kingdome prepared for you, for I was hungry, and ye gaue me to eate &c.*

(16) L. 4. c. 28.

(17) Prou. 19. 17.

(18) Mat. 25. 34.

(19) Cent. 4. l. 44. 83.

Sundry Prot. do reproue S. Auſtine for our Doctrine of the merits of good workes. Oſiander ſaith, (19) *Auſtine ſome-*

sometime in the Article of Iuſtification, ſeemeth to attribute ouer much to the merits of good workes, which are done after a mans Conuerſion. Others charge him for teaching that, (20) *We obtaine remiſſion of our ſinnes and lyfe, not only for Chriſt his ſake through faith, but alſo for the merit of our workes.* Doctour Humfrey ſaith, (21) *It may not be denyed, but that Irenæus, Clemens, and others, whom they call Apoſtolicall, haue litle Apoſtolically inſerted into their writings the opinion of Freewill, and Merits of workes.* Caluin, (22) *I confeſſe that the writers of the ancient Church haue euery where vſed the name of Merit, and I would to God, that by the abuſe of this word they had not giuen to poſterity occaſion of Errour.* Whiteguift acknowledgeth that (23) *Almoſt all the Biſhops, and learned writers of the Greeke Church, and Latin alſo for the moſt part were ſpotted with doctrines of Freewill of Merit &c.* And the very ſame is affirmed by (24) D. Couell. Wherfore the Fathers are moſt cleere in their Expoſitions of the Scriptures for merits of workes, and are therfore reproued by Prot. writers.

(10) Engliſh Harm. of Conf. ſect. 16 c. 23.
(11) *In Iuſtit. part. 2 p. 330.*
(12) *In Hit. 1 3. c. 15. n. 2.*
(13) *Def. p. 472.*
(14) Againſt the Plea of the Innocent. c. 9. p. 210.
(15) See Fulke ag. Rhem. Teſt. in 2. Cor. 9. ſect. 2. f. 322. In his Anſwere to the Marginall notes.
(16) *Ib. in Heb. 11. ſect 5. fol. 417. & in 2. Cor. 9. 23. ſect. 7 f. 176. & in Mat. 19. ſect. 23 f. 18.*
(17) Clapham in his Soueraigne remedy ag. Schiſme. p. 40 Hook. in Eccl Pol. l. 2. ſ. 8 p. 122. Haffent. loc. Theol l. 3. loc. 10. p. 404. (18) *De Eccleſ. l. 4 c. 12.* (19) In his 4. Treatiſes. 4. treat. n. 9. (30) Harm. of Confeſſ. p. 495. (31) *Eccl. Pol. l. 5 ſect. 72. p. 208.*

SECT. IV.

That Proteſtant Writers teach our Catholicke Doctrine of Merit of Workes.

PRoteſtantes (25) teach that *good workes* ſhalbe rewarded in heauen: And that, (26) *Men may, or ought to do good in reſpect of reward.* That, (27) *the degrees of glory ſhalbe according to our workes.*

Fricciu⁹ teacheth that, (28) *Chriſt doth plant in vs vertues of new lyfe, and imparting to vs Merit and Iuſtice with moſt ſingular fruite, he is ſayd, to liue in vs, and by this meanes the glory of Chriſt is not obſcured, but made cleere.*

Perkins acknowledgeth that, (29) *The man iuſtifyed doth deſerue and merit at Gods hands the kingdome of heauen and eternall lyfe in, and by Chriſt.* The Confeſſion of Auſpurge ſpeaking of Faſting, ſaith, (30) *Theſe Exerciſes be good in the godly, and are meritorious workes.* And the like is more then inſinuated by M. (31) Hooker. The ſame Confeſſion alſo acknowledgeth good

good workes to be, (32) *A righteousnes worthy of reward*: and (33) *Spirituall Sacrifices deserving reward.* And that, (34) *Repentance deserued that God should alter his purpose touching Ninive.* And the like is taught by other (35) Prot. amongst whom Melanchon saith that, (36) *After we apprehended our Reconciliation by faith, the worthines of our workes is not* (then) *to be extenuated, for the Scripture setteth honourably forth this Iustice of workes.* Caluin saith, (37) *Our Lord calleth the good workes which he hath bestowed vpon vs, ours, and testifyeth that they are not only acceptable to him, but that they shall haue reward.* And a litle after, *Therfore good workes do please God, neither are they vnprofitable to the workers, but rather in liew of reward they bring the greatest benefits of God.* So certaine it is, euen by the Confession of Protestants, that good workes proceeding from Grace, do truly merite Reward.

(32) Harm. of Conf. p. 273.
(33) Ib. p. 273.
(34) Ib. p. 229.
(35) Ib. p. 100. And Spangburg in his Margar. Theol. de Sacram. p. 48. 50. Hook. Eccl Pol. l. 5. fol. 72.
(36) Loc. Com. de bonis operibus.
(37) Instit. l. 3. c. 15. §. 3.

SECT. V.

Obiections from Scriptures against Merit of Workes, answered.

(1) Rom. 8. 18.

SOme vrge that, (1) *The Passions of this tyme are not condigne to the glory to come.* Answ. The Passions of this tyme considered in their owne nature, or only in reguard of their short continuance, are not worthy of the forsaid glory, which hindreth not their due worth considered as proceeding from faith and Charity. The Passion of Christ himselfe in reguard of that immense glory, which therby he purchased to himselfe, and that vnspeakable good which he merited for man, was but short, and yet he truly merited therby his owne glory, and our redemption. So likewise the pleasures of this world are but few and of litle esteeme, in respect of eternall and most paintull damnation. In like sort it is

(2) Cor. 4. 18.

most true that, (2) *Our tribulation which presently is momentane, and light, worketh aboue measure exceedingly an eternall waight of glory in vs.*

Others vrge those places wherin our Reward is said to

be

be giuen vs of mercy and not of Iuſtice. (3) *Who crowneth thee in mercy and commiſerations.* (4) *Bleſſed are the mercifull, for they ſhall obtaine mercy.* Anſw. Our reward (as S. (5) Auſtine & S. Gregory do expound) is attributed to mercy, not becauſe merit hath not a true reward, but becauſe our merits are giuen of mercy; for no man can merit vnles he be firſt iuſtifyed, which firſt Iuſtification is not merited by workes, but giuen *gratis*, and of mercy.

(1) *Pſ.* 102. 4. (4) *Mat.* 5. 7. (5) *Ep.* 105. & *l. de correp. et gra. c.* 13. *Greg in Pſ.* 7. *Pœnit.*

To the ſame effect are vrged theſe textes, (6) *Come ye and buy without ſiluer, and without all change wyne and milke.* (7) *Not in our Iuſtifications do we proſtrate prayers before thy face, but in thy many Commiſerations.* Anſwere. Wyne and milke (according to S. (8) Hierome) do not ſignify Eternall glory, but preſent Grace, which though it be not obtained without workes, yet not for workes but *gratis*. And in ſigne that wine and milke do ſignify Grace, S. Hierome teſtifyeth, that Chriſtians were accuſtomed to giue to ſuch as were newly baptized, wyne and milke to taſt. Daniel prayeth not here for eternall glory, but for deliuery out of temporall Captiuity, into which the people of God through their ſinnes were caſt.

(6) Iſa. 55. 1. (7) Dan. 9. 18. (8) In Comment.

But many vrge that, (9) *when you ſhall haue done all things that are commanded you, ſay, we are vnprofitable ſeruants; we haue done that which we ought to do.* Anſw. According to S. (10) Ambroſe Chriſt commandeth heerby, that we acknowledge that which we are of our ſelues, to wit, vnprofitable ſeruants, vnable to fullfill thoſe things which he commandeth, whereas by his grace we are made profitable, according to that of the Apoſtle, (11) *If any man therefore ſhall cleanſe himſelfe from theſe, he ſhalbe a veſſell vnto honour, ſanctifyed and profitable to our Lord, prepared to euery good worke.* 2. According to S. (12) Auſtine, we may be ſayd to be vnprofitable ſeruants, when he haue done all things that are commanded vs, becauſe we do nothing but that which we ought, neyther can we exact any reward, had not God of his voluntary and liberall Couenant agreed with vs: for of our own condition we are the baſeſt ſlaues of God, bound without expectation of all reward to performe all workes himſelfe pleaſeth:

(9) *Luc.* 17. 10. (10) *L.* 8. *in Lucam.* (11) 2. *Tim.* 2. 21. (12) *Ser.* 3. *de verb. Dom.*

pleaſeth. And this our baſe eſtate, for the preſeruation of humility, Chriſt heere directeth vs to acknowledge: which nothing hindreth, but that, ſuppoſing the bountifull pact and promiſe of God, we may throgh his grace truly merit, and expect reward, himſelfe ſaying, (13) *Didſt thou not couenant with me for a peny? take that is thyne, and go.* 3. S (14) Chriſoſtome obſerueth that Chriſt ſayth not, you are vnprofitable ſeruants, but ſay, you are &c. willing vs after our good deeds to thinke humbly, leſt they be corrupted with pryde; for that thoſe which worke euill be only vnprofitable, and that thoſe who worke good, profitable, our Sauiour teſtifyeth ſaying, (15) *Well fare thee good and faythfull ſeruant, becauſe thou haſt beene faythfull ouer a few things, I will place thee ouer many things; enter into the ioy of thy Lord. And the vnprofitable ſeruant caſt yee out into the vtter darknes.*

(13) *Mat.20. 13.14. and ſee ver.16*

(14) *In Illud, Elatum eſt Cor Iſaiæ.*

(15) *Mat.25. 20.21. 30.*

Agayne it is obiected that, (16) *The ſtipend of Sinne, death: but the grace of God, lyfe euerlaſting:* And, (17) *To him that worketh, the reward is not imputed according to grace, but according to debt.* Anſw. The Apoſtle (as S. (18) Auſtine teacheth) might truly haue ſayd, *The wages of Iuſtice, lyfe eternall*, as he ſayd, *The wages of Sinne, death*; but yet he did not, leſt any ſhould thinke, that as of our ſelues we haue ſinne, ſo likewiſe we haue Iuſtice: wherefore life eternall is called Grace, not becauſe it is not the reward of merit, but becauſe our merites proceed from grace. In the ſecond place S. Paul ſpeaketh only againſt ſuch workes, as are done without the Grace of God, only by the (19) naturall power of our free will.

(16) *Rom.6. 23.*

(17) *Rom. 4. 4*

(18) *L. de Gra. & lib. Arb.c.8.9. & ep.105. in Enchyr.c. 107.*

(19) *See Eph. 2.8.*

Laſtly, it is generally vrged, that if any thing be attributed to our merits, iniury is thereby done to Chriſtes merits, as though they were not ſufficient. Anſw. The merits of the iuſt are not to be oppoſed to the merits of Chriſt, but ſpringing from them, whatſoeuer prayſe they haue, redoundeth to the merits of Chriſt. (20) *He is the vyne, we are the branches.* (21) *As the branch cannot beare fruit of it ſelfe, vnles it abyde in the vyne; ſo we neyther without Chriſt.*

(20) *Io. 15.5.*

(21) *Io.15.4.*

Now as it nothing detracteth from the glory of the vyne, that the branches are fruitfull, but rather augmenteth the ſame; ſo doth it neither diminish the glory of Chriſt, but rather

ther addeth thereunto, if his ſeruants through Fayth, Charity and other vertues, inſpired and giuen by him, do produce ſuch workes, as are truly iuſt and meritorious. Neyther are the merits of man requiſite for any inſufficiency of the merits of Chriſt, but rather for proofe of their great vertue and efficacy: for the workes of Chriſt not only merited with God our eternall Saluation, but alſo that we might obtaine the ſame through his grace and merits, by our owne merits. To giue light to the world by the ſunne, or to giue heate or cold therto by fyre or water, doth nothing derogate from the power of God, but rather more proueth his Omnipotency, wherby he could worke thoſe things, not only himſelfe, but likewiſe could giue to his Creatures, the power of working.

Laus Deo, & B. Virgini.

Faults escaped in the Print.

In the Text.

Page,	Line,	Errour,	Correction.
39.	8.	contending	contenting
57.	24.	was opinion	was of opinion
71.	21.	satisfaction	sanctification
73.	29.	certainty	certainly
86.	6.	to	so
89.	8.	promiseth	premonisheth
96.	27.	vnauoidable	vnanaylable
97.	12.	for	or
Ibid.	13.	Elections	Election
115.	2.	teacheth	teach
117.	34.	know it,	know not the truth, but also the that know it,
130.	10.	or	of
145.	7.	alike	Asse-like
244.	12.	word	world
247.	12.	ction	perfection
261.	37.	his	this
306.	9.	*intranit*	*initianit*
354.	29.	not we	not what we
374.	28.	many	may
406.	18.	*perato*,	*operato*,
411.	23.	boundant	aboundant
414.	17.	for	or
433.	5.	alleating	alledging
484.	8.	another	other
488.	26.	reply	rely
505.	20.	do	thou
512.	23.	neuer	euer
Idid.	26.	familiar	familiarly
531.	9.	reseruation	reseration
Ibid.	15.	whence	when
532.	27.	he that	that he

Faults in Printing.

170.	penult.	*dele*	the
582.	25.	of you	O you
661.	26.	but	not
689.	12.	Patron	Patrones
698.	3.	facts	fact
719.	31.	*dele*	to will
721.	4.	*Godt, hrough*	*God, through*

In the Margent.

Page,	Figure,	Errour,	Correction.
8.	fig. 9.	81.	18.
13.	11.	52.	cap. 52.
38.	40.	2.	32.
40.	56.	218.	288.
57.	32.	82.	8. 2.
64.	28.	573.	533.
71.	40.	3.	13.
76.	6.	324.	243.
83.	7.	235.	335.
90.	3.	106.	166.
98.	30.	16.	ib.
103.	12	c.	c. 4.
117.	21.	*Io.* 1. 27.	1. *Io.* 2. 27.
Ibid.	24.	62.	26.
255.	8.	53.	35.
276.	11.	180.	380.
287.	5.	*in* 8. 14.	*in Mat.* 8. 14.
325.	34.	*Ep.* 5.	1. *Ep.* 5.
343.	49.	309.	306.
396.	17.	10.	18.
401.	37.	145.	415.
405.	20.	2.	24.
446.	45.	67.	77.
448.	3.	*Mat.* 11.	*Mat.* 3. 11.
Ibid	5.	1408.	1048.

Faults in Printing.

Pag. 491.	61.	266.	260.
498.	106.	16.	61.
504.	21.	&c.	&c. p. 211.
515.	19.	6.	60.
587.	68.	18.	12.
588.	5.	597.	379.
590.	4.	3.	33.
595.	14.	442.	422.
689.	3.	82.	62.
690.	221	223.	23.

AN

AN ALPHABETICALL TABLE,

Directing where to find the particular Points handled in this Booke, throgh euery Chapter and Section, with reference to the *Figures*, where they are to be found.

A.

Abſolution.

FROM ſinne, giuen by Prieſtes. See Pennance.

Abſtinence.

FRom certaine meates: See Faſtes.

Abſurdity.

OF Prot. Reall Preſence. ch. 21. ſect. 2.

Adoration.

OF the B. Sacrament. ch. 21. ſect. 1. fig. 5. Sect. 5. fig. 30. & f. 37.

Angels.

SEe Intercеſſion and Inuocation of Angels and Saintes.

Antichriſt.

PRot. lyes to make the Pope Antichriſt. Ch. 10. ſect. 1. f. 14. Prot. belieue the Pope to be properly Antichriſt. ib. f. 17. Antichriſt is not yet come, nor any Pope Antichriſt. ſect. 2. He is to be one man. ib. f. 5. An open Aduerſary to Chriſtian Religion ib. f. 14. Is to ſit in Hieruſ. ib. f. 20. His Raigne ſhort. ib. f. 23 Enoch and Elias are to oppoſe him. ib. f. 63. See alſo for theſe pointes the Fathers. ſect. 3. & Prot. ſect. 4. Obiect. anſwered. ſect. 5.

Apoſtles.

ERred in their doctrine according to Prot. ch. 2. ſect. 1. f. 29.

B.

Baptiſme.

NEceſſary to ſaluation. ch. 20. ſect. 1. f. 1. ſect. 2. 3. 4. Prot. lyes cõcerning Baptiſme. ſect. 1. f. 7. They thinke it not neceſſary. ib. f. 23. And are therin condemned with ancient Heretickes. ib. f. 31. Their errors concernig Baptiſme. ib. f. 40. Obiect. answered. ib. ſect 5.

C.

Chaſtity.

COunſailed. cha. 11. ſec. 2. f. 1. ſec. 3. f. 1. ſec. 4. f. 7. vowed. ch. 12. ſec. 2. f. 13. ſec. 3. f. 1. by the B V. Mary. ib. ſec. 3. f. 13. ſect. 4. Obiect. answered. ſec. 5.

Chriſt.

THe firſt man that entred into Heauen. ch. 14. ſec. 2. f. 1. See *Limbus Patrum.*

Church.

ROman Church mother of all Chriſtians. Ep. Ded. to the Prot. Nob. Beſt Interpreter of Scriptures. Prep. ſec. 10. What is vnderſtood here by the Church. ib. ſec. 11. Iudge of Controuerſies. ch. 1. ſec. 1. f. 1. ſec. 2. 3. 4. Prot. vntruthes concerning the Church. ch. 1. ſec. 1. f. 15. Church cannot erre in matters of faith and manners. ch. 2. ſec. 1. f. 1. ſec. 2. 3. 4. Prot. lyes in diſgrace of Church and Counſels. ib. ſec. 1. f. 11. According to Prot. the whole Church may erre. ib. f. 15. And the ſame was taught by ancient Heretickes. ib. f. 22. Obiections againſt the Churches not erring anſwered. ib. ſec. 5.

Commandements.

THe 10. Commandements reiected by ſome Prot. ch. 5. ſec. 1. f. 18. They are poſſible to be kept. ch. 32. ſec. 1. f. 1. ſec. 2. 3. 4. Prot. lyes. ib. ſec. 1. f. 11. They deny them to be poſſible. ib. f. 13. And therin agree with former heretickes. ib. f. 24. Their Errors. ib. f. 29. Obiect. answered. ſec. 5.

Communion.

VNderone kind lawfull. ch. 22. ſec. 1. f. 1. ſec. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. Prot. vntruthes ſect. 1. f. 11. They defend the vſe in both kindes. ſec. 1. f. 13. And are therin condemned in ancient Heretickes. ib. f. 16. Their groſſe Errors. ib. f. 19. Obiect. answered. ſec. 7.

Concupiſcence.

WIthout conſent not ſinne. ch. 28. ſec 1. f. 1. ſec. 2. 3. 4. Prot. teach the contrary. ib. ſec. 1. f. 7. And agree therin with former Heretickes. ib. f. 9. Obiect. answered. ſec. 5.

Confeſſion.

OF ſinnes. See in Pennance!

Confirmation.

A True Sacrament. ch. 19. ſec. 1. f. 2. ſec. 2. f. 9. ſec. 3. f. 7. ſec. 4. f. 1.

Conn-

Counsells.

AVthority to determine Cõtrouerſies. ch. 1. ſec. 1. f. 3. ſec. 2. f. 31. ſec. 4. f. 28. Cannot erre. ch. 2. ſec. 2. f. 26. ſec. 3. f. 7. ſec. 4. f. 19.

Counſailes Euangelicall.

PRoued. ch. 11. ſec. 1. f. 1. ſec. 2. 3. 4. Prot. vntruthes concerning Counſailes. ib. f. 3. They deny all Counſailes. ib. f. 10. For which ancient Heretickes were condemned. ib. f. 14. Prot. Errors concerning Counſailes. ib. f. 20. Obiect. anſwered. ſec. 5.

Croſſe.

TO be honoured. ch. 17. ſec. 3. f. 12. The ſigne therof to be made. ib. f. 17. ſec. 4. f. 26.

D.

DEcrees. See *Counſells.*

E.

Errours.

SEe in euery Chap. ſec. 1. §. Prot. Errours.

Euchariſt.

SEe Reall Preſence.

Extreme-Vnction.

A True Sacrament. ch. 19. ſec. 1. 2. 3. 4.

F.

Faſtes preſcribed.

ANd abſtinence from certaine meates proued to be lawfull. ch. 27. ſec. 1. f. 1. ſee 2. 4. Prot. vntruthes. ib. ſec. 1. f. 11. They impugne them. ib. f 15. They agree with ancient Heretickes. ib. f. 18. Their Errors. ib. f. 33. Obiect. anſwered. ſec. 5.

Fathers.

AVthority to interpret Scriptures. ch. 1. ſec. 1. f. 5. ſec. 4. f. 47.

Freewill.

PRoued ch. 31. ſee. 1. f. 1. ſec. 2. 3. 4. Prot. vntruthes. ib. ſec. 1. f. 24. Prot. deny it. ib. f. 26. And agree therin with ancient Heretikes. ib. f. 30. Their groſſe Errors. ib. f. 36. Obiections anſwered. ſec. 3.

H.

Hell.

SEe *Limbus Patrum.*

Hereſies.

SEe ſec. 1. of euery Chapter. §. Prot. agree with ancient Heretickes.

I.

Ieſus.

THis name is to be honoured. ch. 17. ſec. 4. f. 21.

Images of Saintes.

MAy be made, and worſhipped, proued. ch. 17. ſec. 1. 2. 3. 4. Prot. vntruthes. ſec. 1. f. 9. Prot. impugne Images. ib. f. 14. For which ancient Heretickes were condemned. ib. f. 18. Prot. Errors

Errors in this. ib. f. 24. The Image of God himselfe, or the B. Trinity may be made. sec. 2. f. 12. They may be placed in Churches. ib. f. 21. f. 3. & worshipped. f 30. Obiect. answered. sec. 5. The second Commandement not taken away in behalfe of Images. sec. 3. f. 6. sec. 5. f. 33.

Indulgences.

PRoued. ch. 26 sec. 1. f. 1. sec. 2. 3 4. Prot. vntruthes. ib. sec. 1. They impugne Indulgeces ib. f. 25. And are therin condened, with ancient Heretickes. ib. f. 28. Obiect. answered. sec. 5.

Intercession & Inuocation.

OF Angels and Saintes proued ch. 16. sec. 1. 2. 3. 4. Prot. lyes. sec. 1. f. 11. They deny this Intercession & Inuocation. ib. f. 18. And are therin condemned with ould Heretickes. ib. f. 27. Prot. Errors herin. ib. f. 34. The Angels and Saintes do know our Prayers. sec. 2. f. 1. sec. 4. Angels and Saintes do pray for vs. ib. f. 26. sec. 3. 4. We may pray to them. sec. 2. ib. f. 45. sec. 3. 4. Obiect. answered. sec. 5.

Iudge of Controuersies.

SEe Church, and Scriptures.

Iustice and faith may be lost.

PRoued. ch. 34. sec. 2. f. 20. sec. 2. f. 20. sec. 4. f. 5.

Iustice inherent.

PRoued ch. 35. sec. 1. f. 1. sec. 2. 3. 4. Prot. deny it. ib. sec. 1. 14. And therin agree with ancient Heretickes. ib. f. 17. Their Errors. ib. f. 21. Obiect. answered. sec. 5.

Iustification by faith & workes.

PRoued ch. 26. sec. 1. f. 1. sec. 2. 3. 4. Prot. lyes. ib. sec. 1. f. 7. They teach only faith to iustify. ib. f. 11. wherin they agree with condemned Heretickes. ib. f. 17. Their Errours. ib. f. 20. Obiect. answered. sec. 5.

K.

Knowledge.

KNowledge of true Religion necessary. Pref. to the Prot. Read. how to be gained. ib.

KNowledge of our Predestination, & saluation not infallible. ch. 34. sec. 1. f. 1. sec. 2. 3. 4. Prot. vntruthes. ib. sec. 1. f. 9. They teach that euery man ought infallibly to belieue his owne Predestination and Saluation. ib. f. 11. Prot. Errors. ib. f. 18. Obiect. answered. sec. 5.

L.

Limbus Patrum.

CHrist descended into Hell. ch. 14. sec. 1. 2. 3. 4. Prot. in the vnderstanding of this Articles are deuided amongst themselues. ib. sec. 1. f. 11. Their Errors in this ib. 18. Before Christes descending the soules of the iust were in *Limbus*. sec. 2. f. 10. Obiect. answered. sec. 5.

Luthers grosse errors. c. 9. sec.

ſec. 1. f. 30. and ſee ſec. 1. of euery Chapter. §. Proteſtant Errors.

M.

Maſſe.

A True Sacrifice. ch. 23. ſec. 1. f. 1. ſec. 2. 1. 4. Prot. Vntruthes. ib. ſec. 1. f. 10. They deny all proper externall Sacrifice. ib. f. 28. And are therin condemned with ancient Heretickes. ib. f. 31. Obiect. anſwered. ſec. 5.

Matrimony.

A True Sacrament. ch. 19. ſec. 1. 2. 3. 4.

Methode.

OBſerued throughout this Booke. Pref. to the Prot. Reader.

Moyſes.

A Prieſt. cha. 1. ſec. 2. f. 4. ſec. 3. f. 1.

N.

Nobility.

WHerin it conſiſteth. Ep. Dedic. to the Prot. Nob. Nobility by birth much to be honoured. ib. by vertue more. ib. Chriſtian Nobility what, and moſt to be eſteemed. ib. To degenerate from Nobility diſhonorable. ib.

O.

Omnipotency of God

DEnyed by Prot. ch. 21. ſec. 1. f. 75.

Orders.

A True Sacrament. ch. 19. ſec. 1. 2. 3. 4.

P.

Paſtours of the Church.

ARe to decide controuerſies. ch. 1. ſec. 2. f. 32. ſec. 4. f. 56. According to ſome Prot. the Church for ſome ages had no Paſtors. ch. 2. ſec. 1. f. 25. Paſtors of the Church are to be obeyed. ch. 2. ſec. 2. f. 42.

Pennance a true Sacrament.

PRoued. ch. 19. ſec. 2. fol. 15. ch. 24. ſec. 1. f. 1. ſec. 2. 3. 4. Prieſtes power to forgiue ſinnes. ib. ſec. 1. f. 1. ſec. 2. f. 1. ſec. 3. ſec. 4. Confeſſion of ſinnes neceſſary. ib. ſec. 1. f. 4. ſec. 2. f. 14. ſec. 3. f. 1. ſec. 4. Prot. vntruthes. ib. ſec. 1. f. 18. They reiect this Sacrament, and all neceſſity of Confeſsion. ib. f. 20. And are therein condemned with former Heretickes. ib. f. 34. Their dangerous Errours. ib. 43. Pennance impoſed after Confeſsion. ſec. 3. f. 17. Obiect. anſwered. ſec. 5.

S. Peters Primacy.

PRoued. ch. 8. ſec. 1. f. 1. ſec. 2. 3. 4. Prot. giue this Primacy ſome to Miniſters, others to the Laity, others to Temporall Princes, men or women. ib. f. 10. Deniall of S. Peters Primacy condemned for hereſy. ib. f. 14. Primacy denyed to Chriſt

as man by Prot. ib. f. 16. Obiect. answered. sec. 5.

Pope.

POpe cannot erre in defyning matters of faith. ch. 2. sec. 2. f. 48. sec. 3. f. 10. Successor to S. Peter in Primacy. ch. 9. sec. 1. f. 1. sec. 2. 3. 4. Prot. vntruthes against the Pope. sec. 1. f. 16. Some Prot. made a woman their supreme head. ib. f. 20. Others admit none but Christ. ib. f. 21. The denial of his Primacy condemned in ancient Heretickes. ib. f. 25. Obiect. answered. sec. 5.

Pouerty.

COunsailed. ch. 11. sec. 2. f. 5. sec. 3. f. 5. Pouerty vowed. ch. 12. sec. 2. f. 10. sec. 3. f. 2. 6. sec. 4. f. 4.

Priestes.

ARe not to be maried. ch. 13. sec. 2. 3. 4. Prot. lyes for Priestes mariage. ib. sec. 1. f. 1. They allow their Bishops and ministers to marry. ib. f. 11. For which they are codemned with ancient heretickes. ib. f. 13. Prot. Errors cõcerning Priestes mariage. ib. f. 18. Obiect. answered. sec. 5. Priestes power to forgiue sinnes. See in Pennance.

Priuat spirit.

NOt sufficiẽt to decide Controuersies, or to interpret Scriptures. ch. 4. sec. 1. f. 1. 2 3. 4. 5. Challenged by Prot. and ancient Heretickes. ib. f. 6. 8. Obiect. answered. ib. sec. 6.

Punishment, or Satisfaction.

REmaineth, the fault being pardoned. ch. 25. sec. 1. f. 2. sec. 2. 3. 4. Prot. lyes. ib. sec. 1. f. 14. They deny all necessity of any Satisfaction. ib. f. 20. Obiect. answered. sec. 5.

Purgatory, and Prayer for the dead.

PRoued. ch. 15. sec. 1. 2. 3. 4. Prot. vntruthes concerning Purgatory. sec. 1. f. 9. Prot. deny Purgatory. ib. f. 11. And are therein codemned with ancient Heret. ib. f. 14. Prot. Errors concerning Purg. ib. f. 20. Obiect. answered. sec. 5.

R.

Reall Presence.

PRoued. ch. 21. sec. 1. f. 1. sec. 3. 4. 5. 6. 10. Prot. vntruthes. ib. sec 1. f. 21. Their Reall Presence what. ib. sec. 1. f. 33. sec. 2. They are condemned with ancient Heret ib. sec 1. f. 38. And teach grosse Errors. ib. sec. 1. f. 68. Obiect. answered. sec. 7. 8. 9. Reseruation of the B. Sacrament. ch. 21. sec. 1. f. 4. sec. 5. f. 15.

S.

Sacraments.

THey conferre Grace. ch. 18. sec. 1. f. 1. sec. 2. 3. 4. 5 Prot. vntruthes concerning the Sacraments ib sec. 1. f. 27. They equall them only with the Sacraments of the old Law. ib. f. 36. They are condemned with ancient

ancient Heretickes. ib. f. 39. They diſlike the word Sacrament. ib. f. 44. And teach that the Deuill may adminiſter Sacramentes. ib. f. 47. That women may preach. f. 49. That all Chriſtians are Prieſtes. f. 48. And that Intention is not neceſſary in the Adminiſtration of them. ib. f. 50. Obiect. anſwered. ſec. 6. Sacraments ſeauen. ch. 19 ſec. 1. f. 2. ſec. 2. 3. 4 5. Prot. vntruthes concerning the number of Sacraments ib. ſec. 1. f. 33. They allow only two. ib. f. 58. wherin they are condemned with ancient Heret. ib. f. 55 They hould groſſe Errors herin. ib. f. 70. Obiect. anſwered. ſec. 6.

Sacrifice.

SEe Maſſe.

Scriptures.

ARe the true word of God, and in all thinges to be beleiued. Prep. ſec. 1. f. 1. ſec. 2. 3. 4. Reiected by ſome Prot. ib. & ch. 1. ſec. 1. f. 53. To corrupt or reiect Scriptures impious. Pre. ſec. 5. Scriptures true ſenſe neceſſary to be found Prep. ſec. 6. Scriptures how ſaid to be the booke of Heretickes. ib. f. 7. They admit ſeuerall true ſenſes. ib. ſec 7. The literall ſenſe affoardeth the ſtrongeſt argument. ib. ſec. 7 ep. 16. Miſticall ſenſe not ſo forcible. ib. f. 13. How to diſcerne the literall ſenſe from the figuratiue. ib. ſec. 8. And how to fynd out the true ſenſe. ib. Rules obſerued by Prot for the fynding out of the true ſenſe, refuted. ib ſec. 9. The certaine Rule therof is the Church. ib. ſec. 10. What Catholickes heere vnderſtand by the Church, ib. ſec. 11. Scriptures according to ſome Prot. ſole Iudge of Controuerſies. ch. 1. ſec. 1. f. 24. according to others the Priuate ſpirit. ib. f. 30. Appealing to Scriptures vſed by Prot. cõdemned by the Fathers in Ancient Heretickes. ib. f. 35 Prot. Errors againſt the Authority of Scripture. ib. f. 53. Scriptures difficult to be vnderſtood. ch. 3. ſec. 1. f. 1. ſec. 2. 3. 4. 5. According to Prot. moſt eaſy. ib. f. 3. Conference of Scripture doth not make it eaſy. ib. ſec. 6. Obiections anſwered. ib. ſec. 7. Sundry Bookes of Script. reiected by Prot. ch. 5. ſec. 1. f. 18.

Sinnes.

MOrtall and Venall: ch. 29: ſec. 1. f. 1. ſec. 2. 3. 4. According to Prot. all Mortall. ib. ſec. 1. f. 7. wherin they are condemned with Ancient Heretickes. ib. f. 12. Their groſſe Errors. ib. f. 17. Obiect. anſwered. ſec. 5. God is not the author of ſinne. ch. 30. ſec. 1. f. 1. ſec. 2. 3. 4. 5. Prot. lyes. ib. ſec. 1. f. 19. They teach that he is the Author of ſinne. ib. f. 12. And agree therin with former Heretickes. ib. f. 43. Obiect. anſwer. ſec. 6.

Toby,

T.

Toby, Iudith &c.

ARe Canonicall Scriptures. ch. 5. sec. 1. f. 1. sec. 2. 3. 4. Denied as Apocriphall by Prot. ib. f. 9. Obiections answered. sec. 5.

Traditions.

PRoued. ch. 7. sec. 1. f. 1. sec. 2. 3. 4. Prot. lyes concerning Traditions. ib. sec. 1. f. 6. Traditions denied by Prot. ib. f. 16. And ancient Heretickes. f. 21. Sundry particulars Traditiõs by Prot. sec. 4. f. 4. Obiect. answered. sec. 5.

Translations of the Bible.

THe vulgar Latin proued to be best. ch. 6. sec. 1. f. 1. sec. 2. f. 34. Reiected by some Prot. sec. 1. f. 15. Luthers Translation corrupt. sec. 2. f. 1. And so are all other Prot. Translations. ib. Obiect. against the Vulgar Translation answered. sec. 3.

Transubstantiation.

CHap. 21. sec. 1. 2.

V.

Vowes.

VOwes of perfection lawfull. ch. 12. sec. 1. f. 1. sec. 2. 3. 4. Prot. Vntruthes, concerning vowes. ib. sec. 1. f. 11. vowes impugned by Prot. ib. f. 14. For which they are condemned with ancient Heret. ib. 20. Obiections answered. sec. 5.

W.

Workes of the iust, are not all sinnes.

PRoued ch. 33. sec. 1. f. 1. sec. 2. 3. 4. Prot. teach all workes of the iust to be sinfull. ib. sec. 1. f. 5. Prot. Errors. ib. f. 9. Obiect. answered. sec. 1. f. 5. Prot. Obiect. answered. sec. 5.

Workes that are good do merit.

PRoued ch. 37. sec. 1. f. 1. sec. 2. 3. 4. Prot. vntruthes. ib. sec. 1. f. 13. They deny all merit to workes. ib. f. 17. And therin agree with former Heretickes. ib. f. 21. Their Errors. sec. 1. f. 22. Obiect. sec. 5.

Workes that are good, do iustify.

SEe Iustification.

FINIS.

C 580
39711

REPRODUCED FROM THE COPY IN THE

HENRY E. HUNTINGTON LIBRARY

FOR REFERENCE ONLY. NOT FOR REPRODUCTION